

JPRS-UKO-84-015

20 September 1984

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 9, June 1984

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

## NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

## PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

20 September 1984

USSR REPORT  
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 9, June 1984

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

## CONTENTS

Living, Working, Struggling in Leninist Fashion (K. U. Chernenko) .....	1
K. U. Chernenko's Reply to Kelly .....	10
K. U. Chernenko's Answers to Questions From American Journalist J. Kingsbury-Smith .....	13
K. U. Chernenko's Answers to Questions From the Newspaper PRAVDA .....	15
K. U. Chernenko's Speech at the Reception in Honor of the Participants in the Economic Summit Conference of the CEMA Member Countries on 14 June 1984 .....	19
On the Main Directions of Further Developing and Strengthening the Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation of CEMA Member Countries .....	22
Declaration of the Member Countries of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance: "Maintenance of Peace and International Economic Cooperation" .....	31
In the CPSU Central Committee .....	41
The Nature of Contradictions in the Socialist Economy and the Forms of Their Solution (V. Kulikov) .....	48

Collective Thought, Close-Knit Action (V. Markov) .....	62
Strengthening the Legal Base of Socialist Society (A. Sukharev) .....	75
Leninist Approach to Analyzing Developments in Physics (I. Kikoin) .....	89
A Communist and Ardent Patriot of the Socialist Motherland: On the 70th Anniversary of Yu. V. Andropov's Birth .....	101
Neruda Was, Is and Will Be (Volodia Teitelboim) .....	112
Outer Space Is No Place for Military Adventures (M. Rebrov) .....	125
America Is Not the United States Only (V. Bushuyev, B. Martynov) .....	132
Attention: Revanchism! (V. Nekrasov) .....	146
The Bookshelf .....	150



PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 9,  
June 1984

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : June 1984

Signed to press : 18 June 1984

Copies : 927,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda"  
"Kommunist", 1982

LIVING, WORKING, STRUGGLING IN LENINIST FASHION

PM290958 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84)  
pp 3-10

[Speech by K. U. Chernenko at the All-Army Conference of Secretaries of Komsomol Organizations on 28 May, 1984]

[Text] Dear comrades:

Today is an unusual day for us in many respects. By a happy coincidence our conference is starting on Border Troops Day. And the border troops are surely already in a festive mood. In some way this is also my personal festival, for my party biography and my party work began in the ranks of the border troops. And so it is with special feelings I congratulate all of you on this festival (applause).

We have another reason for holding our conference both in a businesslike and a festive atmosphere. And this reason can by no means be called coincidental.

It is said that success is a combination of talent and persistence, initiative and great labor, and with regard to the serviceman, I would add, feats of arms also. I am glad to inform you that the Komsomol organization of the Soviet Army and Navy has been awarded the Order of the Red Banner for its great services in the cause of the armed defense of the socialist fatherland, for the courage and heroism displayed by Komsomol servicemen in the battles for the homeland and for its fruitful work to educate the young people in the Army and Navy (sustained applause). Comrades, please accept my most cordial congratulations (applause). This award, of course, arouses feelings of genuine joy. But, I am sure, it will not prevent us from conducting a serious and businesslike talk about the great and important tasks of the Army Komsomol. And all the more so, since they will have to be resolved in a complicated international atmosphere, in which there has been a palpable increase in the military danger, in the threat of nuclear war, in conditions of a very acute ideological struggle.

The reactionary struggles of imperialism cannot reconcile themselves to the maintenance of contemporary world development. They are aware that the wheel of history in its natural movement is working in favor of socialism, for the assertion everywhere of the principles of national liberation and social

justice. That is the reason they are striving to conduct international affairs from positions of strength and are trying to violate the natural course of history. That is the reason for their armaments programs which are unprecedented in scale. This is the reason for their persistent efforts to disrupt the military-strategic balance.

The CPSU and the Soviet Union are doing and will do everything necessary to ensure that relations between states regardless of their social system are relations of peaceful coexistence, good-neighborliness and equality. As you know, the USSR and the countries of the socialist communist constantly submit initiatives aimed at reducing international tension and at strengthening peace. When it is a question of the security of the peoples, foreign policy and diplomacy can do alot, but not everything. In the world arena we encounter political forces to whom good will is alien and who are deaf to the arguments of reason. And here an indispensable role is played by the restraining might of our defense potential. At present it is not only the guarantee of the creative labor of the Soviet people, but also the guarantee of universal peace on earth (sustained applause).

Such, comrades, is the responsibility that lies on your shoulders, too, today. And we are convinced that you will be up to that responsibility. The guarantee of this is the entire glorious history of the Army Komsomol.

The party and the people remember the heroic feats of Komsomol members on the fronts of the Civil and Great Patriotic wars and in the defense of our state borders. They remember them and take pride in them. For all generations of Soviet people they will always serve as an inspiring example of loyalty to patriotic and military duty. Our Army Komsomol keeps sacred and adds to the wonderful traditions of its father. Substantial proof of this lies in the internationalist duty fulfilled with honor today by Komsomol servicemen.

Modern military service is, of course, not an easy matter. It requires tireless toil, systematic training, combat tempering, psychological endurance and constant presence of mind.

Today, as always, our army is strong not only in its modern equipment and good training but also in its being charged with ideological awareness and in its lofty moral and political spirit. You, along with commanders and political workers, have the job of ensuring profound understanding by every serviceman of the responsible mission he is fulfilling.

As we approach a notable date--the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War--work in military-political education must be undertaken more widely. With even more insistence we must nurture in young people love for the homeland and hatred for its enemies, of lofty political and class vigilance, and of constant readiness to perform great deeds. And this work must be conducted in such a way that it contains a little less idle chatter and a little more creativity and search for innovation, without which work with young people is wholly unthinkable.

Lenin's behest, "Study military matters in a proper way!," should be the pivot around which all the work of the Army Komsomol is built.

The Soviet Army is also a school of growing to patriotic maturity and a school of cultivating genuine socialist internationalism, not in words, but in deed. There are representatives in its ranks today of all the nationalities of our country, and the ties of soldierly friendship being engendered here will then link many of them all their lives.

I would also like to speak of another facet of our Army's internationalism--its strengthening links with the servicemen of the armies of the fraternal countries of the Warsaw Pact. It is an important task of yours to take care of and develop these links in every way, and there is no doubt that you will also cope with this task.

These, comrades, are the thoughts that I wanted to share with you today, speaking of the affairs and concerns of the Army Komsomol.

You probably assume that it is now time to present the award (excitement in the hall). But, let us not rush with this. Since Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov has already granted me this rostrum, I would like to take advantage of it also to express certain thoughts on the work of our entire Komsomol. All the more so, since in the near future we in the Politburo intend to examine all aspects of the issue of improving the party leadership of the Komsomol and enhancing its role in the education of young people.

Our Komsomol has borne the name of Lenin for 60 years. The 6th Komsomol Congress, adopting this decision, clearly stressed that "the Leninist education of young people can be achieved only by unifying it around the old guard, which alone guarantees the correct direction of the activity of young people and their being forged and tempered in a truly bolshevik way."

At that time this proposition was used emphatically above all against the attempts to pit the party youngster against the older communists. At the same time, it contains an idea of unfading political value--the idea that a primary condition and very important guarantee of the revolutionary continuity of the generations in socialist society is the leadership of the party and the youth movement. And the CPSU tirelessly puts this principle into practice. In doing this it is placing in the forefront, of course, not its own prestige but the interests of a worthy continuation of the building of a new society.

The party does this, developing in every way possible the autonomous nature of the Komsomol as a public organization, stressing its absolute organizational independence. For, as Vladimir Il'ich Lenin said, "Without complete independence young people will be unable either to turn themselves into good socialists or to prepare themselves for leading socialism forward" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, p 226). At present this Leninist thesis sounds no less topical than at the time it was formulated.

You, dear comrades, belong to that generation of Soviet people which, entering independent working life, has available previously unknown possibilities. Feats which yesterday still seemed a fantasy will be within your power. But please do not labor under a delusion: In some respects life will be more



simple for the present Soviet youth, but in others it will be rather more difficult than it is for us, the older generation.

Let us turn to that area where life has already taken or is certain to take the overwhelming majority of your peers. I have in mind production, the economy.

At the call of the party, the Komsomol is enthusiastically undertaking to solve the tasks that are most important for the country. Its contribution is important for the construction of the majestic Baykal-Amur railroad, to the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod gas pipeline, which was built in record time, to the transformation of Russian's Nonchernozem Zone and the opening up of the riches of Siberia, the Far East and the Extreme North. In front of a lathe, behind the steering wheel of a combine, in a scientific laboratory, millions of boys and girls, displaying heroism in their daily work life, are writing new shining pages in the chronicle of Komsomol glory (applause).

We are confident that the Leninist Komsomol's contribution to the country's development will grow and multiply. I will say more. In drawing up the plans for the next five-year plan and until the start of the next century, we are counting to a considerable extent precisely on the skill of the hands, the daring of thought and the work conscience of the present youth. After all, the brunt of the work to fulfill these plans is to be carried out precisely by those who are of Komsomol age today.

Our national economy has reached a level where transferring it onto the path of intensification has become the most acute necessity. You know that the party energetically supports all initiatives aimed at increasing the efficiency of production, better organization of labor and growth of its productivity. And it is good that all our Komsomol has become actively involved in this great creative task.

To build production facilities in accordance with the latest word of science and technology and to implement everything that is new and progressive is the task before us. It opens up before young people truly unprecedented opportunities to show their talents and capabilities. But one will also have to deal with difficulties that are not negligible and to assume heightened responsibility. Such are the demands of the contemporary production.

In general, as you can see, the dialectics of life have their way [beryet svoye]. Work for you will be both easier, and, in a way, tougher.

You represent the first generation of Soviet people to enter conscious life under the conditions of a developed socialist society. Think more often about this fact, and especially about the responsibility that it entails. You yourselves, it may be presumed, will be able to draw the right conclusions from this, but I cannot fail to mention one conclusion, which is the main one. It is that you have been fortunate enough to have been born and raised in a society that has achieved a level of social progress that is the highest in world history. But this, of course, does not mean that all that is left for you now is merely to relish the fruits of your predecessors' labors. Nothing of the sort: It is incumbent upon you to roll up your sleeves and become

involved with all your strength in that hard and multifaceted work which is defined by the party as perfect developed socialism. It is precisely this comprehensively weighed, scientific formula that has been made the basis, as you know, of the new edition of the CPSU Program which is to be adopted at the party's 27th Congress--a program planned for a historically long period.

I am confident that you, young people, will undertake this work ardently and with enthusiasm. I would like to stress, comrades, that the services of the present generation of Soviet people--and of course of the Komsomol members, of young people--before the motherland, before history, will be measured, before everything else, by how successfully we will cope with the tasks of perfecting the socialism that we have built. In other words, by how far we advance toward bringing it into complete correlation with the socialist ideal, in order to remove from our lives all that contradicts the idea of social justice which is the central idea of our outlook.

We can and should make our society one that in all things corresponds to the loftiest and most demanding concepts of socialism--concepts that were scientifically substantiated by Marx, Engels and Lenin, concepts that inspire working people and the popular masses throughout the world to struggle for socialism, concepts that have never allowed us to rest content with what has been achieved or to tolerate shortcomings and imperfections.

You have probably heard the argument that it is only in his youth that man is able to be a romantic, a dreamer, and that with age this unfailingly passes; everyday concerns crowd in from all sides, and no place remains for dreams, for striving toward lofty ideals. Well, this does happen to some people. However, this is by no means a law of nature. In any case, in our country this is neither compulsory nor should it be.

We live according to another principle, according to the principle of revolutionaries, because Lenin, who called for fighters to create a new society, taught us: "It is necessary to dream!" Thus, none other than Vladimir Il'ich Lenin himself, both in his youth and his mature years, right up to the last days of his life, was always able to dream with inspiration and in an infectious way. His main dream, about the communist future of our native country, lives on in the minds, hearts, and deeds of the Soviet people. We have never given it up, and never will (applause). And now, when decades of socialist construction are behind us, when we have become wiser and more realistic in appraising our prospects, we have schooled ourselves to make a path more faithfully and reliably toward the realization of our highest goal: communism.

It is understandable, comrades, that the novelty of the tasks confronting us objectively pushes into one of the top positions the question of improving the forms and methods and the style itself of Komsomol activity.

First, concerning forms of work: To what should we direct first and foremost attention there?

To begin with, Komsomol organizations frequently still try to solve new tasks by obsolete and unoriginal methods and means. Some people, to use Lenin's



words, "allow themselves to be carried away by a 'bright' slogan, not grasping the new, socioeconomic and political situation, not taking into account changes in conditions..." (op. cit., vol 35, p 253), forgetting the "need to be flexible to the maximum in their tactics" (op. cit., vol 41, p 87).

Forms of work should not be set in their ways or be ossified. They need continuous development. Furthermore, we must not fail to take account of the striving for what is new that is inherent in young people. You will agree that the numerous campaigns and reviews which are prolonged for many years, even if the slogans are periodically changed, are losing their attraction for young people.

Second, there are certain divergences between the forms of work and the rising material and spiritual needs of young people. Komsomol organizations do not always manage to react to the tendencies linked with this and to give them the necessary direction. Komsomol work is not yet everywhere arranged to take account of the plans that young men and women have for their lives. The Komsomol committees sometimes avoid vital problems which are genuinely worrying young people. Is this not why a certain percentage of young people shun active work in the Komsomol?

Finally, in choosing the forms of Komsomol work, account must of course be taken of the distinctive features of age, level of education, and the interests and inclinations of young people toward this or that type of activity. This requirement too, however, is not always observed in practice.

As you see, no few contradictions have accumulated here.

I believe that the Komsomol committee should make a critical analysis of the existing forms of work and in a certain sense reevaluate them. I am sure that the creative striving, innovation and the bold experiment proceeding from real life, which were always inherent in the Komsomol, will not let it down this time, either.

This is important not only for successful fulfillment of new tasks presented by life; one would want to wish the Komsomol also greater initiative and creativeness in resolving problems with which it has always actively dealt, such as the moral-aesthetic and physical education of young men and women and acquainting them with the best achievements of the culture of the fatherland and the world, and, of course, the active participation of every member of the Komsomol in strengthening public order.

And now, as to the style of leadership. It is gratifying that over recent years a number of measures have been taken by the Komsomol committees to improve it. However, what has been done, comrades, is only the beginning of a large task.

The essence of this work lies, on the one hand, in heightening the degree of organization and order and discipline in the Komsomol ranks and, on the other, in developing the initiative and activity of Komsomol members. The main obstacle which must be overcome is the considerable layer of formalism, overorganization, and parade nature in the activity of many Komsomol

committees and Pioneer organizations. This was discussed, as you remember, at the 26th Party Congress and at the June 1983 Central Committee Plenum.

Let us consider enthusiasm for all kinds of "measures." This shortcoming has been discussed many times, but no visible change has taken place. Yet a passion for numerous movements and campaigns inevitably leads to formalism. Many of them on investigation frequently prove to be mere paper shuffling, and the bewitching multimillion figures for participation turn out to be much more modest. It is no secret either that some "measures" are of obviously ostentatious nature and are designed, as one says, to impress others.

The matter is not, of course, in the complete rejection of mass campaigns or vivid demonstrations. One should have a sense of moderation here and remember that conducting them should complement the education work of the union. Formalism, paperwork and bureaucratism cannot be tolerated in anything. They are doubly and triply less tolerable in the activity of the Komsomol and even less so in its leadership of the Pioneer organization. The desire to regulate everything and everywhere and to squeeze the work of the Komsomol organizations into a procrustean bed of directives from above contradicts the very basis of the Komsomol as a democratic, independent organization.

Komsomol committees should make a sharper turn toward intensifying everyday, specific organization and educational work both among Komsomol members and in the children's communist organization. It is important to strengthen ties of Komsomol workers with youth masses and to subordinate their activity to the creation of a lively, creative atmosphere in all the primary organizations. Enhancing the Komsomol's role in educating the younger generation and forming in every young person a lofty philosophical view, moral-political culture, and stable immunity against influence of bourgeois ideology and any form of petit bourgeois consumer psychology in solving the tasks set them by the party depends to a great extent precisely on this.

We also understand that fulfilling all those tasks requires improvement in the party leadership of the Komsomol too and removing shortcomings existing here. In some cases we encounter instances of excessive supervision of Komsomol organizations. It is not difficult to see behind them a certain anxiety that young people can also make mistakes. One cannot agree with such a position, or it will be necessary, as we say, to keep on mothering the young people all their life. For, according to an ironic statement of Marx: "When learning to walk, a man is also learning to fall, and only by falling does he learn how to walk" (K. M. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 1, p 53). It is necessary to trust the Komsomol more. But this has to be an exacting trust. The other extreme is inadmissible, of course: the basic lack of attention to Komsomol affairs and concerns.

I would like to note in this connection that we by no means intend to judge the standard of the party leadership of the Komsomol only by the number of questions which party committees consider. It is primarily important to penetrate constantly and deeply into those social and ideological processes that are taking place in the youth environment, to analyze them systematically, to help Komsomol organizations choose the basic directions and the most effective forms of work.

All this has to be done with the greatest tact. Maximum convictions, comradely attention, practical help--such are the compulsory requirements for the style of the party leadership of the youth organization. Here more than anywhere else--to use Lenin's words--it is necessary to "take into account beside the 'political,' also the 'pedagogical' viewpoint" (op. cit., vol 11, p 177).

Much depends here on live, direct contacts of party leaders with youth. It is necessary to adopt a rule: to be more often where young people are working, learning and resting, and to converse openly with them about urgent matters.

Here again, this must be done not only from the political but also, I would say, from the psychological viewpoint. In such contacts one becomes infected with the energy of the youth, some kind of new view of familiar facts is revealed, and one begins to understand better the real characteristics, the distinctive features of the present-day youth. For young people, as Lenin said, "have necessarily to approach socialism in a different way, not by the same path, not in such a form, not in the same situation as their fathers" (op. cit., vol 30, p 226). Naturally, it is not a question of flirting with young people or flattering them. In our ideological and principled stance we have always to be consistent and firm. This firm conviction of ours has to be passed on to the young people.

To lead the Komsomol also means to help it in the solution of such youth problems as Komsomol organizations themselves cannot handle on their own. I mean primarily social problems. In the education of the youth, as in all ideological work, the real success comes only when it is supported by a well-conceived socioeconomic policy, and young people have quite a few social problems. I would first like to highlight the issues of education and training in the broadest sense.

You know about the major steps mapped out by the party and which are already being implemented within education reform. They are intended to help every young person to prepare himself better for independent working life and to create, figuratively speaking, the capital which will give him a high rate of return for long years.

It is also necessary to be concerned everywhere about creating conditions in order that every young person, after finishing school or higher educational establishment as well, can refresh and expand his knowledge. This is required both by the dynamics of modern production, and by the tasks of comprehensive development of the individual.

Sociologists assert that the chief reason for high labor turnover among young workers is dissatisfaction with labor content and conditions. And that is so. The party's course of reconstruction and modernization of production today makes it possible to resolve this problem more energetically.

It is understandable that this problem will not disappear at once. However, transformation of the conditions and enrichment of the content of labor will proceed much faster if the Komsomol takes a more active part in the process.



Here there is a broad sphere for the application of knowledge and initiative, the creative inventiveness in which our young people are not lacking. Evidently there are also places where we will have to fight against those who live a quiet life. In a word, here again, as Lenin stressed, "it is not sufficient for Soviet power to give orders, or for the party to give a particular slogan; it is necessary that the younger generation itself should set about this task" (op. cit., vol 41, p 315).

Provision of well-appointed housing for young families is a big problem. You know that our country has no equal in the world for the scale of housing construction, but the acuteness of the housing problem is still far from having been eliminated, and additional reserves must be sought to resolve it. In connection with this, we should perhaps think about the possibility of offering long-term credits to young families to get housing on a cooperative basis, and the Komsomol could sponsor construction by young people's cooperatives.

Lastly what I would like to say today is the following: There are at the moment more than 1.5 million communists in the ranks of the Komsomol. It is through them that it is best of all to exert influence on the Komsomol. Not by force of power of course but, using Lenin's words, by force of "authority, by force of energy, of greater experience, of greater versatility, greater talent" (op. cit., vol 7, p 14). The work of communists in the Komsomol is responsible party work and it must be carried out with honor (applause).

In general, it may be said that the issue of Komsomol cadres is a key one. Everything here has immense importance: ideological conviction and moral purity, organizational grasp and the ability to react sensitively to the specific needs of young people, professional maturity and the ardor characteristic of youth. That is why questions of selection and promotion of Komsomol cadres to administrative, economic and, of course, party work must always be the focus of attention of party committees. I am sure that the people who have passed through the good school of leadership in the Komsomol justify by their labor such confidence. It is understood that all this fully applies also to the Army Komsomol.

And now comrades, permit me to perform the honorable mission entrusted to me by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and to present the high state award, the Order of the Red Banner, to the Komsomol organization of the Soviet Army and Navy!

(All stand up. Under tempestuous and sustained applause, Comrade K. U. Chernenko pins the order on the banner of the Soviet Army and Navy Komsomol. Chants in the hall: "Glory, glory, glory to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union!" "Glory to the Soviet Armed Forces!" "Glory to the Leninist Komsomol!")

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15

K. U. CHERNENKO'S REPLY TO KELLY

PM291830 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84)  
pp 11-12

[PRAVDA, 30 May 1984]

[Text] Esteemed Mrs Petra Kelly:

We share your concern about the possibility of the use of nuclear, chemical and other weapons. Every reason exists for such concern, the more so since some people would like to get new consignments of chemical munitions, as well as neutron weapons, into Western Europe, first of all into your country, in the wake of the new nuclear missiles.

In this connection, it is appropriate to recall the special responsibility of those states on the territory of which the deployment of new types of mass destruction weapons has been started or is being planned—responsibility both for the destiny of their own peoples and for European peace and international security as a whole.

You ask how to preclude the possibility of the use of nuclear or chemical weapons against the FRG and what should be done to achieve this. The conditions, as we see it, boil down actually to one: Under no conditions should the FRG ever become a bridgehead for the preparation and perpetration of aggression against the USSR and its socialist allies with the use of the means of warfare that you mention or any others. In this case your country can be fully assured that nothing would threaten it. It can be said that it will be insured against a retaliatory strike.

Whoever deploys on his territory first-strike weapons aimed at neighboring states advances the threat of a return strike, a strike of retribution. Whoever turns others into a target inevitably becomes a target himself. This must be made entirely clear.

For all states not to feel worried about their security, concern should be shown, as you yourself rightly believe, Mrs Kelly, for the liquidation of all mass destruction weapons both in your country and in the West and the East in general. For its part the Soviet Union has repeatedly stated its readiness to act thus, given that other states act similarly.

I, and other statesmen of our country, have already had occasion to note that the readiness of nuclear powers to subordinate their relations to certain norms and to undeviatingly adhere to them in their policy, as the Soviet Union is already doing, would be of fundamental importance. I will remind you only of some of them which directly relate to the questions you raised. The Soviet Union has officially and solemnly declared that it will never use nuclear arms against countries which have renounced the production and acquisition of such arms and do not have them on their territory. More than that, our country has assumed, unilaterally at that, the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear arms. The USSR, together with its Warsaw Pact allies, offers to reach agreement with the NATO countries on the non-first use of conventional weapons as well as of military force in general. My country is prepared to do this.

What, may I ask, prevents the other nuclear powers from assuming similar commitments if their thoughts are about peace, as is stated by their leaders? For if there is no first nuclear strike then, naturally, there will be no subsequent ones.

Clearly, in such conditions it would be much easier to reach agreement also on measures for the practical reduction, and in the final account, the total liquidation of nuclear weapon stockpiles. The Soviet Union has set forth a realistic stage-by-stage program of achieving this aim, which is of a global nature.

As to the European continent, here too the USSR proposes practical solutions: from a radical reduction of nuclear weapons in accordance with the principle of equality and identical security to the full freeing of Europe from both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union just as resolutely opposes the use of chemical weapons. We have made specific proposals on removing them from military arsenals altogether. The USSR and other socialist countries have proposed agreements on freeing Europe from all types of chemical weapons as one of the top priority steps.

Such is our position. I hope it gives an exhaustive answer to the questions of interest to you. In order to achieve a resolute change for the better, it is necessary to break the stubborn sabotage of those who openly bank on force, declare the use of means of the mass annihilation of people a "legitimate" and "moral" way of solving outstanding issues and achieving their political aims. It is for the sake of this that missiles intended for unleashing aggression are being deployed on the soil of West European countries and why chemical weapons are being brought from across the ocean and stockpiled there.

A barrier should be erected against the policy of deliberately placing the fuse of nuclear and chemical war under the European continent. The task of canceling out these sinister designs urgently faces all the peoples, political parties, and public movements. It must be solved without delay and without stinting any effort.



The Soviet Union will continue to do everything incumbent upon it to achieve a turn toward normalization of the European and international situation in the interests of ensuring peace and the security of peoples.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15

K. U. CHERNENKO'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM AMERICAN JOURNALIST J. KINGSBURY-SMITH

PM111458 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 1984 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) pp 13-14

[PRAVDA, 12 June 1984]

[Text] Question: During its examination of the military programs submitted by the Reagan administration which it is planned to finance from the military budget for fiscal 1985, the U.S. Congress House of Representatives adopted an amendment prohibiting the allocation of appropriations for carrying out tests of American antisatellite weapons in space in the event that the USSR and other countries refrain from carrying out such tests. In view of this vote would the USSR government agree on a reciprocal basis with the United States to freeze antisatellite weapon tests for another year or longer?

Answer: This vote in the House of Representatives clearly reflects American legislators' concern at the possibility of the arms race spreading to space. There is every reason for such anxiety. The question now is this: Either the militarization of space is averted, or else space will become the source of a terrible danger hanging over all mankind.

As for the Soviet Union, it consistently advocates ensuring that space remains peaceful. In an endeavor to promote the solution of this task, the USSR last year unilaterally assumed a commitment not to place antisatellite weapons in space. In other words, it introduced a unilateral moratorium on such launches for as long as other states, the United States included, refrain from placing any type of antisatellite weapons in space. This commitment naturally covers test launches of antisatellite weapons.

This moratorium announced by the Soviet Union remains in force. At the same time, for all its usefulness, we regard a moratorium as only the first step toward a total ban on antisatellite weapons, including the elimination of such systems as already exist. It is for precisely this reason that we are suggesting to the United States that official talks be immediately begun in order to reach an agreement on this score.

The Soviet Union's specific proposals on this question are well-known and enjoy the support of the overwhelming majority of UN member states. The U.S. government alone is against it.

Question: Would it be possible to monitor a freeze on tests of antisatellite weapons effectively, and if so, how?

Answer: The Soviet Union is convinced that monitoring a freeze on antisatellite weapons tests is possible and, moreover, is extremely reliable above all through the national technical means the sides have at their disposal. Statements by many prominent U.S. experts also favor such a conclusion.

Effective monitoring of the sides' compliance with a moratorium on orbital antisatellite weapons could be ensured by the means both sides have at their disposal for tracking objects in space. As for suborbital antisatellite systems, then apart from the aforementioned facilities it would also be possible to enlist the use of other earth-, sea- and air-based radioelectronic facilities of the United States and of the Soviet Union. In uncertain situations an exchange of information and consultations could be effected. Should the need arise, other forms can also be found.

Given real interest in finding effective solutions, any questions relating to the matter, including questions of monitoring, could be successfully solved during the talks being proposed by the Soviet Union both on antisatellite weapons and also on the prevention of the militarization of space as a whole.

I would like to emphasize once again: It is necessary to reach agreement on these questions without delay, before space weapons are deployed and before a spurt is made in the space arms race--a spurt whose consequences are unpredictable. Tomorrow may be too late.

Those who, alluding in advance to the "impossibility" of monitoring agreements limiting the arms race in space, are attempting to preclude any productive talks in this sphere and are deliberately working toward ensuring that they have a free hand to pursue a course of militarizing space in the expectation of obtaining military advantages.

I will speak plainly: Such a course is both futile and dangerous. If it leads anywhere, it is only to a sharp intensification of the threat of war. This cannot be allowed. Urgent and effective measures to keep space peaceful are needed. The Soviet Union is wholly in favor of this path.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15

K. U. CHERNENKO'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM THE NEWSPAPER PRAVDA

LD131711 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84)  
pp 15-17

[PRAVDA, 14 June 1984]

[Text] Question: Recently, the leaders of seven major capitalist states held a meeting in London. What, in your opinion, was the nature and the content of that meeting?

Answer: The regular meeting of the "Seven" was purportedly convened to examine economic issues. Above all, however, it got down to politics. This is clearly indicated by the documents adopted in London.

Again, as was also the case at the NATO session in May, much was said to declare peaceable intentions and an interest in reducing the level of armaments, including nuclear. Again, the Soviet Union was urged to engage in a dialogue and talks. Regrettably, however, these intentions and appeals failed to be backed up with anything tangible. Why is it happening like this?

One explanation lies right on the surface; the American press literally hums about it. It is considerations connected with the U.S. presidential elections.

The deeper reason is that the participants in the meeting of the "Seven" rubber-stamped provisions which run counter to the interests of detente, disarmament and peace. The dialogue and talks are mentioned to the extent that they need a screen to somehow cover up the transformation of the territories of some of the West European countries into a launching pad for the new U.S. missiles. Reality, however, is that the line of the missile deployment remains unshakeable, which has been repeatedly stated by the U.S. administration. Washington and other NATO capitals are, of course, aware of the fact that this is increasingly blocking the possibility of talks, raising still higher the barrier in the way of reducing nuclear armaments. To aim new U.S. nuclear missiles at the Soviet Union and its allies and at the same time to urge talks—is this not political duplicity?

Is there a need for dialogue and for talks? Both yesterday and today our answer has been the same--yes. But a dialogue which is honest, and talks that are serious. In these we stand ready to engage at any moment.

The Soviet Union has put forward proposals for deep reductions in nuclear armaments. Their realization would not infringe upon anyone's interests. We want these issues to be considered in earnest at the negotiating table as soon as the American side withdraws its essentially ultimatum-like conditions for talks. In this connection, a true positive shift in the stance of the United States and its allies would not be left without a proper response on our part.

The Soviet Union suggests reaching accords on a whole package of measures capable of truly reducing the level of military confrontation and precluding the use and threat of force in international life. These proposals are known.

I will single out, as an example, the problem of preventing the militarization of outer space. The entire world recognizes its utmost topicality. Our proposals on how to resolve this problem have been submitted in Washington. But it does not want to handle this problem, does not even want to discuss it. In all likelihood, the American administration is fond only of its own arrogant stance whose essence is opening outer space to the most fantastic kinds of armaments and is thus trying to gain military superiority. It is clear that in this very important sphere, too, we do not see a reciprocal desire for solid talks, much less the desire for an accord. No talk about the benefit of dialogue will camouflage this fact.

We address our unequivocal appeal to the United States and its allies. It is high time they confirmed by concrete deeds their share of responsibility for the destinies of peace, realized the futility of the position-of-strength policy and banking on the arms race, and displayed a genuine rather than ostentatious readiness for dialogue, for talks in order to find mutually acceptable solutions to questions on which the future of mankind depends. The Soviet Union is not wanting in such readiness.

Question: How can the discussion of "international terrorism" at the London conference be appraised?

Answer: In London this problem was turned inside out. They expatiated on some technical details, but passed over in silence the main issue. And they did that deliberately.

Criminal acts of terrorism are being committed in front of the entire world; committed on a small, medium and large scale, single-handedly and by groups, or even directly with the broad involvement of armed forces of some states. This was the case in Grenada; this was the case in Lebanon; this is the case now in Nicaragua. But for some reason they did not say a word about all this at the conference of the "Seven." Apparently, they decided that if they should play it false, they should play it high.

The Soviet Union condemns any manifestations of terrorism. As we resolutely reject the policy of the United States which has opted for terrorism as a



method of conducting affairs with other states and peoples. And it does not benefit those who practice "state terrorism" to set forth declarations on some kind of "democratic values," as happened at the London conference. This is just turning around the adventurist concept of the "crusade," another attempt to shift the ideological struggle to the sphere of inter-state relations.

On the whole, the statements issued both on terrorism and on "democracy" serve the aims of pulling major capitalist states, including Japan, even closer to the militarist course of the American administration.

Question: And how can the discussion of international economic problems in London be summed up?

Answer: A lengthy declaration was adopted on this scheme. It has many words, but drowned by them are the acute socioeconomic problems which are intrinsic to the capitalist system in general and which have become even more painful of late. This includes, first of all, unemployment, inflation, and soaring costs of living; that is all those phenomena which mercilessly hit broad strata of the working masses in capitalist countries. No serious measures to take the sting out of these problems were outlined in London. But then, how could they have been, if it is the American recipe--that of letting the rich become richer and the poor poorer--that was being forced on the meeting?

One can also feel that, in exerting massive pressure on its partners, Washington is trying to resolve its own economic problems and difficulties at the expense of others. The trade and economic expansion of Japan also makes itself felt. In short, the knot of the interimperialist contradictions is being tightened still further, and they break out to the surface one way or another.

The economic problems would be a hundred times easier to solve if it were not for the arms race--this insatiable machine gobbling up countless intellectual and material resources. But it was precisely this central issue that was ignored at the meeting of the "Seven."

It is indicative that the problems of profound concern to the developing countries also found themselves shoved to the back burner. Declaratory statements of a general nature cannot hide the fact that there is at work a ruthless exploitation by the industrially developed capitalist countries, above all the United States, of the economically weak countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Judged by everything, the intention is to continue this policy. This can lead to only one result--the deepening of the chasm between the rich and the poor countries which will find tomorrow even harder than today. Here too, the arms race, which is being spurred on by Washington and its NATO allies, is making itself felt in the most immediate manner.

It is no coincidence that everywhere around the world at present the question is being asked as to whether the London meeting truly intended in any way to try to improve the situation in the developing countries. The answer given to this question in the developing countries themselves is clearly in the negative.



In the light of what took place at the meeting of the "Seven" it would, apparently, not be unwarranted to recall the position of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries which consistently advocate restructuring the international economic relations on a just and democratic basis. This has just been confirmed with renewed force by the CEMA summit meeting now in session in Moscow. Our indefatigable and, one can say without exaggeration, energetic struggle for halting the arms race aims--in addition to its immediate objective: that of reducing the military threat--at redirecting the huge material means available to the goal of raising the well-being of the peoples, to the needs of health care, culture, education, and housing construction. A significant part of the resources could be used as assistance to the peoples of the developing countries. We are pursuing this line in our bilateral relations, and we advocate it at international forums, including the United Nations. We shall continue to be guided by this in the future, too.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15

K. U. CHERNENKO'S SPEECH AT THE RECEPTION IN HONOR OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE ECONOMIC SUMMIT CONFERENCE OF THE CEMA MEMBER COUNTRIES ON 14 JUNE 1984

LD141118 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 [signed to press 18 Jun 84] pp 18-19

[Text] Dear Comrades:

The economic conference of the highest leadership of the CEMA member countries has completed its work. I believe that I will express the unanimous opinion if I say it was a success.

We have summed up a wealth of experience in organizing truly equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation of sovereign socialist countries. Thirty-five years ago, when the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance was being established, we had no and could not possibly have ready blueprints for such cooperation. In establishing fraternal cooperation, just as in building a new advanced society, we blazed and continue to blaze the trails which no one before us ever traversed. It is understandable that on that long historical path there were shortcomings and setbacks due to both objective and subjective factors. The most important thing, however, is that the vital necessity and efficiency of our all-round economic ties has been explicitly confirmed.

As is known, the previous summit meeting in 1969 charted the course toward the development of socialist economic integration of the CEMA countries. Today one can justifiably say that such a course has conclusively proved its value. Our community has grown stronger and larger. The international prestige of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance has been enhanced. Its positive effect on the economic life of each fraternal country has become stronger. Without large-scale cooperation we naturally could not have attained the results we have now. And these are truly impressive.

Over the past 15 years the socialist community has doubled the volume of its industrial production, whereas capitalism increased it by slightly more than one-third. But, of course, it is not a matter of the rates of economic growth alone. Basic social advantages of our system have been revealed to a higher degree. Socialism effectively demonstrates that it is a society of genuine equality and progress, steady economic advancement, a society where the interests of the working class, the working people, are paramount.

During the meeting we have had a frank, detailed and fruitful exchange of views on key problems of life of the socialist community and the international situation. The community of assessments and views on principle and important matters has been reaffirmed and the collective will to continue to enhance the unity and cohesion of the fraternal parties and states has been expressed.

A major step forward has been made in harmonizing economic policy. We have signed major program documents. We have mapped out long-term guidelines for economic cooperation of the fraternal countries. All this should make it possible to use better the advantages of socialist integration for the benefit of our people, to create prerequisites for coping more efficiently with the tasks of intensifying production and evening the levels of development with the CEMA member countries. Of course, it is understandable that good decisions of themselves will not produce results unless active and purposeful actions are taken to implement them. Therefore, the realization of the accords reached comes in line with the interests of all countries of our community, the interests of socialism and stronger peace on earth.

The states represented at the meeting have put forward a realistic program of action for improving international economic relations, something in which most countries of the world are interested. By doing so, socialism has once again demonstrated that it is a natural ally of all those who are fighting for an end to discrimination, for uprooting all forms of exploitation in international economic relations, against the use of economic levers as a means of political pressure and intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states.

The participants in the meeting recognize their responsibility for the destinies of peace and the prevention of nuclear war. A dangerous test of strength being imposed on us by most reactionary imperialist circles, primarily in the United States, is not our choice, not our policy. But we will be able to stand up for ourselves--let no one have any doubt about that.

The CEMA member countries offer their alternatives to the growing military threat--the course toward consolidating peace and easing international tensions, toward constructive cooperation of all sovereign countries, including in the economic sphere. We urge all states, all those who stand for detente, all those who are against nuclear madness, to make joint efforts in this direction.

Our call is addressed to the socialist countries that are not represented at the meeting. The very nature of the new social system objectively necessitates joint actions in the name of preserving peace.

Our call is addressed to the developing countries, members of the Nonaligned Movement. Peace and security of peoples and the curbing of the burdensome arms race are an indispensable condition for their further social and economic progress.

Our call is also addressed to the countries of the West. We offer honest terms of peaceful coexistence. Socialism does not need war. It will be able to prove its advantages in a peaceful competition.

Comrades! It is gratifying to note that the meeting took place in an atmosphere of friendship and the sincere striving to understand better the interests and needs of each other and to make our cooperation even closer and more efficient. We draw for strength on the inexhaustible wellspring of Marxism-Leninism, on the loyalty to internationalism. We are united by the common concern for the common cause, the responsibility for the destinies of socialism.

On behalf of the Soviet delegation I express gratitude and convey best wishes to all the participants in the meeting.

Let me offer a toast to the further strengthening of unity and cohesion of socialist countries! To your success, dear comrades and friends!

To a durable peace on earth!

To the health and happiness of all comrades present here!

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15

ON THE MAIN DIRECTIONS OF FURTHER DEVELOPING AND STRENGTHENING THE ECONOMIC,  
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION OF CEMA MEMBER COUNTRIES

LD150845 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84)  
pp 20-26

[Text] The leaders of the communist and workers' parties and heads of government of the countries that took part in the summit economic conference of CEMA member countries discussed the most important questions of the present stage and prospects of the economic development and mutual cooperation of the fraternal countries and unanimously agreed on the need and topicality of further expanding the scale and enhancing the effectiveness of this cooperation.

The participants in the conference noted that in the 1970s, after the 23rd special session of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance, that was held at summit level in 1969, the countries of the socialist community, owing to the selfless labor of the peoples under the guidance of communist and workers' parties, substantially consolidated their economic, scientific and technical potential, carried out major social programs and ensured the stable growth of the peoples' living standards and the further development of science, education, culture, public health and social security. The interaction of the fraternal parties and states has become deeper and multifaceted. This facilitated the considerable successes in the building of socialism and communism.

The experience and practice of CEMA member countries convincingly demonstrate the fundamental advantages over capitalism that are inherent in socialism, such as social and national equality, plan development of the economy, ideological cohesion of society, confidence in the morrow, constant concern for man and the all-round development of the individual. The socialist way of life is enriched on this basis, the political system of socialism is developed and socialist democracy, which in practice guarantees man the most extensive rights and freedoms, is perfected.

The economic and social progress of CEMA member countries is in sharp contrast with the crisis situation in capitalist countries. Capitalism's inability to rid itself of deep economic crises and acute sociopolitical upheavals is being confirmed again.



The increased economic power of CEMA member countries has become the material basis of their policy of peace, relaxation of international tension and mutually advantageous cooperation with other states. The international prestige of socialism, which is the determining factor of mankind's social progress has grown considerably and its influence on the course of world development has increased.

The correctness and timeliness of the collectively worked out course of strengthening cooperation and developing socialist economic integration, which have become an important factor of the all-round progress of each of the fraternal countries and of bringing closer the levels of their economic development, have been fully confirmed.

Principles of socialist internationalism, respect for state sovereignty, independence and national interests, noninterference in internal affairs of countries, full equality, mutual advantage and comradely mutual assistance, which are recorded in the CEMA bylaws and the comprehensive program of further deepening and perfecting cooperation and developing socialist economic integration, have become established in relations between them, are being implemented and will be consistently implemented. A considerable contribution to the deepening of the all-round interaction of the fraternal states, to the strengthening of their unity and cohesion is made by each CEMA member state, especially the Soviet Union.

The participants in the conference noted the topicality of the comprehensive program of further deepening and perfecting cooperation and developing socialist economic integration, of the long-term multilateral and bilateral programs of cooperation, the provisions of which are being embodied in practical deeds.

The planned development of the national economy and mutual cooperation of CEMA member countries made it possible to substantially ease in many fields the impact on their economy of the economic crisis that has erupted in the capitalist world and to counteract the aggressive course of the imperialist circles and the attempts of the United States and some of its allies to pursue a policy of economic pressure and discrimination.

At the same time the participants in the conference noted that there still exist considerable reserves for expanding mutual cooperation, increasing specialization of production and cooperation in production, increasing mutual trade in the interests of a more effective utilization of the production and scientific and technological potential of the fraternal countries and raising the living standards of their peoples.

The leaders of the fraternal parties and governments concentrated attention on the solution of tasks stemming from internal and external conditions which have changed in recent years.

They agreed to instruct the planning and economic bodies of their countries, when drafting economic development plans for the period remaining until the end of the current five-year period and coordinating annual protocols on trade, to look for the possibility of expanding on a mutually advantageous



base trade with CEMA member countries also in excess of the volumes of operative long-term agreements.

The participants in the conference expressed confidence that the CEMA member countries have all that is necessary to raise mutual cooperation to a new level. They are unanimous in their view that the most important tasks of CEMA member countries in the field of the economy and mutual cooperation at the present stage are:

To accelerate the switching of the economy to the intensive path, to raise its efficiency by perfecting the structure of social production, by rationally and thriftily using the existing material and labor resources, by making better use of the fixed assets and of the scientific and technological potential;

To ensure the further growth of social production as the mainstay of strengthening the material and technical basis of socialist society and raising the living standards of the people;

To raise the technical level, reliability, durability and quality of output, to expand and quicken the renewal of the range of products;

To develop the export potential, above all in the industrial sectors;

To site productive forces more efficiently;

To speed up the process of the gradual evening out of the levels of economic development of CEMA member countries and first of all to bring the levels of economic development of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Republic of Cuba and the Mongolian People's Republic up to those of the European CEMA member countries.

The conference decided to take a new step in increasing the coordination by CEMA member countries of their economic policy in areas connected with their mutual cooperation and by interested countries also in other fields of socioeconomic development to the extent to which these countries shall find it necessary. By this coordination the CEMA member countries mean the working out on a collective basis of ways of solving major economic problems of mutual interest and of much importance for the determining by each of the fraternal countries of directions of economic development and cooperation for a lengthy span of time, the joint definition of ways of direct interaction in the areas of science, technology, material production and capital construction.

All this activity should facilitate the mobilization of the potentials of countries and the strengthening of their mutual cooperation for purposes of the dynamic and balanced development of the economy of each country and of the entire community of CEMA member states on the basis of the all-round intensification of production and the introduction of world achievements of scientific and technological progress, facilitate the provision of the necessary resources, in particular fuel, energy, raw materials, foodstuffs and manufactured consumer goods, modern machines and equipment, the active participation of CEMA member countries in the international socialist and

world division of labor, the acceleration of the processes of the evening out of the levels of their economic development.

It was found useful to intensify the collective work of the communist and workers parties and the governments of CEMA member countries to develop cooperation and socialist economic integration, to exchange experience in economic management. It was found expedient to hold regular meetings at the level of the highest party and state leadership to coordinate fundamental directions of the strategy of the long-term economic development of CEMA member countries and strengthening of the international socialist development of labor.

The participants in the conference proceed from the premises that the coordination of economic development plans will be concentrated on the solution of priority tasks and will be the main instrument of coordinating economic policy in fields connected with mutual cooperation, and by interested countries also in other fields, of forming stable economic and scientific and technical ties between CEMA member countries and also serve as the basis for the drafting of their national plans in the part that concerns mutual cooperation.

When coordinating economic development plans the planning and foreign trade bodies, with the participation of bodies of branch management, and when necessary also of economic organizations, should coordinate first of all the main directions of the specialization of countries in the international socialist division of labor, the measures to increase mutual deliveries of the most important goods, the main proportions and the structure of the mutual trade turnover, and objects of production cooperation.

Measures shall be taken for the coordination of plans to be concluded before the start of the new plan period and for the results of this coordination to be formalized in appropriate agreements and reflected in national plans.

The participants in the conference view the extensive development of production cooperation and the establishment of direct ties between associations, enterprises and organizations as an important direction of perfecting the economic mechanism of cooperation and raising its effectiveness. For this purpose the CEMA member countries will carry out measures to grant them the necessary powers and to create the corresponding conditions for cooperation. Favorable conditions will also be created for the establishment on a cost-accounting basis of joint firms, enterprises and other international economic organizations.

Viewing the utmost acceleration of scientific and technological progress as being especially topical, the participants in the conference reached agreement on the joint drafting on the basis of national programs of a comprehensive program of scientific and technological progress for a period of 15 to 20 years as a basis for the formulation of a coordinated and in some fields a uniform scientific-technical policy to ensure the speediest solution through joint efforts of the most important questions in the field of science and technology and the implementation of the achieved results in production in the interested countries on mutually advantageous terms.

It was found necessary to strengthen cooperation in the field of standardization and unification, to expand the mutual exchange of information on scientific-technical accomplishments.

It was agreed that in machine building cooperation will be of a comprehensive nature and directed mostly at supplying the key production sectors with machines and equipment of a high quality and of world technical standards. It was stipulated that countries will produce both finished products and parts and assemblies, as well as products used in the whole of the machine building industry, and that the mutually delivered equipment will be fully provided with spares. Special attention will be given to the development of electronics, microprocessors and industrial robots.

The participants in the conference hold that by mobilizing their own resources and intensifying mutual cooperation it is possible to ensure the solution by all CEMA member countries of the raw materials and fuel-and-energy problems. For these purposes the CEMA member states will carry out a set of measures directed first of all at an economical and rational use of energy carriers and raw materials, at lowering the energy and material intensity of production on the basis of the introduction of progressive technological processes, modern machines and equipment, changing the structure of production and the consumption of raw materials and energy carriers. At the same time they will take the appropriate measures to develop cooperation in the production and mutual deliveries of fuel, energy and raw materials.

To create economic conditions ensuring the implementation and continuation of deliveries from the Soviet Union of a number of types of raw materials and energy carriers to satisfy the import requirements in volumes determined on the basis of the coordination of plans and long-term accords, the interested CEMA member countries will gradually and consistently develop within the framework of an agreed upon economic policy their production and export structure and carry out the necessary measures for this in the field of capital investments, reconstruction and rationalization of their industry with the aim of supplying the Soviet Union with the products it needs, in particular foodstuffs and manufactured consumer goods, some types of construction materials, machines and equipment of a high quality and of world technical standards.

Mutually acceptable decisions on these questions will be worked out with due consideration for the objective economic conditions of the USSR and other CEMA member countries as well as the structure of production and mutual trade of these countries. This will ensure a mutually advantageous compensation of expenditures and open up the possibility of further deepening a stable long-term specialization of production within the framework of the socialist community.

It was found expedient to make a change in the structure of energy production and to expand cooperation in priority development of atomic power generation and the fuller utilization of all types of energy carriers, including new



nontraditional sources of energy. The CEMA member countries will jointly work out programs to build nuclear power plants and nuclear heat-supply plants in the year 2000.

The CEMA member countries will direct their efforts and mutual cooperation at perfecting the structure of metallurgical production, raising the quality and expanding the range of output, lowering the metal-intensiveness of products, increasing the production of high-quality steel and other high-quality materials for the manufacturing industry.

Agreement was reached to substantially increase already in the coming years the output and deliveries of chemicals on the basis of mutual cooperation, specialization and cooperation and to ensure a fuller utilization of the raw material resources of the chemical industry.

The participants in the conference regard as a top priority task the utmost development of sectors of the agroindustrial complex and cooperation in this sphere. The CEMA member countries will direct their efforts at increasing the production of food on the basis of the introduction of progressive technologies, the development and perfection of the material and technical basis of agriculture and the food industry, and also at increasing mutual deliveries of foodstuffs with the aim of improving the population's supply and consumption structure.

They will carry out the corresponding measures, including the participation of interested countries in capital investments and in providing exporter countries with other economic incentives on a bilateral or multilateral basis by the interested countries.

To ensure a better supply of the population with high-quality consumer goods the CEMA member countries will take joint measures to strengthen the raw materials base for their production, carry out the technical refitting and modernization of the corresponding industrial sectors, substantially increase the output of such products for mutual delivery, expand cooperated production of durables and increase the exchange of high-quality consumer goods.

The CEMA member countries will carry out agreed upon measures for the comprehensive development of mutual transport ties providing, in particular, for a closer coordination of plans to develop transport, coordination of capital investments in the development of the transport infrastructure of countries, which may be of mutual interest, for increasing the capacity of border railroad stations, perfecting the system of planning and conditions of carriage of foreign trade freight by all types of transport, paying special attention to the need to improve the conditions of freight shipping to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the Republic of Cuba.

Mutual trade will further increase on the basis of the expansion and increase in cooperation and economic integration.

The CEMA member countries consider it their international duty to continue on the existing just basis the provision of assistance to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Republic of Cuba and the Mongolian People's Republic in



accelerating the development and raising the effectiveness of their national economies with due account for the tasks of socialist industrialization by these countries, and to facilitate their extensive participation in the international socialist division of labor.

The CEMA member countries find it necessary in present-day conditions to make the mechanism of cooperation within the framework of the CEMA more effective, meeting the tasks of perfecting the international socialist division of labor and raising its effectiveness, the timely solution of developing problems and increasing the interest of CEMA members in the priority development of mutual cooperation. The task of organically combining cooperation in the field of plan activity with the active utilization of commodity-monetary relations retains its relevance.

The operating system of price-setting in mutual trade and the monetary-financial instruments of cooperation will be further developed and the collective currency—the transfer ruble will be strengthened.

The development and perfection of the mechanism of cooperation should be facilitated also by the proposals currently now being drafted by CEMA to bring closer the structures of economic mechanisms of CEMA members in areas of paramount importance for the development of mutual economic relations.

The leaders of the communist and workers parties and the heads of government of CEMA members find it necessary further to consistently develop economic cooperation with other socialist countries that are not CEMA members, proceeding from the important role that such cooperation plays in the economic development of each country and in the strengthening of socialism's positions in the world.

The CEMA member countries will further pursue the principled line of developing trade, economic, scientific and technical ties with all countries of the world on the basis of mutual advantage, equality, noninterference in internal affairs and respect for adopted international commitments.

They will further expand cooperation with developing countries proceeding from the premise that this will facilitate the growth of national economies and the strengthening of the economic independence of these countries, and the development of mutually advantageous economic ties with them.

They are further prepared to develop mutually advantageous trade, economic and scientific and technical ties with developed capitalist countries and with all countries in the world.

The conviction was confirmed that the development of such ties will facilitate the strengthening of understanding among peoples and the easing of international tension.

The participants in the conference find it necessary to increase the role of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance in organizing cooperation among CEMA members and to perfect the activity of its bodies and those of international organizations set up by these countries.

The participants in the conference express the firm conviction that the consistent fulfillment of the adopted decisions will give a new important impulse to the further steady development of their economies and mutual cooperation, to the growth of the prestige and attraction of socialism in the world, to a still closer and all-round strengthening of the unity of CEMA member countries united as they are by common fundamental class interests and the ideology of Marxism-Leninism.

For the People's Republic of Bulgaria:

Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgaria Communist Party, chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria

For the Hungarian People's Republic:

Janos Kadar, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party

For the Socialist Republic of Vietnam:

Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam

For the German Democratic Republic:

Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic

For the Republic of Cuba:

Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, deputy chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba

For the Mongolian People's Republic:

Yumjaagiyn Tsedenbal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic

For the Polish People's Republic:

Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic

For the Socialist Republic of Romania:

Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR

For the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic:

Gustav Husak, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15

**DECLARATION OF THE MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC MUTUAL ASSISTANCE: 'MAINTENANCE OF PEACE AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION'**

LD150959 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84)  
pp 27-35

[Text] The highest representatives of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the German Democratic Republic, the Republic of Cuba, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, who met in Moscow for an economic conference of the member countries of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance, consider it their duty to draw the attention of the peoples of the world and governments to the need to take urgent measures to ensure the normal development of international political and economic relations in order to strengthen world peace and to promote the progress of mankind.

The Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact adopted in Prague on 5 January 1983 and the Joint Statement of the party and state leaders of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Czechoslovakia in Moscow on 23 June 1983 put forward a constructive and realistic program for the solution of the most urgent world problems. In accordance with those documents, the participants in the economic conference of the CEMA member countries at the summit level reiterate their resolve to act in the interests of ensuring peace and improving international relations in the economic area.

The leaders of the communist and workers parties and the heads of state and government of the CEMA member countries proceed from the assumption that the world political and economic situation affects more than ever before the interests of all the countries and peoples, and express their deep concern about the enhanced threat to peace. International tension has grown substantially as a result of the course pursued by the aggressive forces of imperialism, and their attempts to achieve military superiority, to pursue a policy "from strength" and to interfere in internal affairs, to encroach upon the national independence and sovereignty of states and to consolidate and recarve "spheres of influence." Old hotbeds of tension are rekindled and new conflicts and crisis situations provoked in different parts of the world.



The escalation of the arms race by those forces constitutes one of the main causes of the aggravation of political and economic instability in the world, increases the threat of nuclear war, jeopardizes the very existence of mankind and puts an ever heavier burden on the peoples of the world by diverting huge material and financial resources and slowing down economic and social progress.

The already tense situation was further aggravated with the beginning of the deployment in certain NATO countries of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles, which ushered in a new, very dangerous phase of the nuclear arms race on the European continent. This development forced the Soviet Union to take a number of measures in response. The talks on nuclear weapons in Europe and on strategic armaments were broken off.

The ruling U.S. circles are trying to exploit for their political ends international economic contacts as well. Violating the commonly recognized norms of state-to-state relations, they breach existing agreements, organize trade, credit and technological blockades and resort to all sorts of methods of pressure, embargo and "sanctions" even in food trade with regard to those countries which reject their encroachments and diktat. They make attempts to impose this policy line on their allies and also on other states.

Such actions are aimed not only against socialist countries. These forces use different pretexts and preach anticommunism in pursuit of their goal of resolving domestic problems at the expense of others, to weaken rivals, to squeeze them out of world markets, to establish control over whole regions of the world and to subvert the positions of countries and even individual companies maintaining business contacts with socialist countries. This is damaging to international economic relations as a whole.

Reliance on force, escalation of the arms race and subordination of economic relations to aggressive policy hamper the solution of the basic problems of world economic development and make it difficult to overcome the economic crisis in the capitalist world, compounded by energy, raw materials, food and monetary crises. Disorganization and restrictions in international trade and instability in the world commodity markets are growing, the tide of protectionism is rising and international monetary-financial relations are breaking, in particular, because of the imposition of artificially raised interest rates.

All this aggravates economic difficulties and leads to the further deterioration of the situation of the mass of working people in capitalist countries. The runaway growth of prices continues, unemployment has reached unprecedented proportions and people feel more and more uncertain of their future. The onslaught on detente has spilt over into an attack on the rights and social positions of the working class, the peasantry, the broadest segments of society.

The overwhelming majority of developing countries are finding themselves in particularly dire straits. Using every means of political and economic pressure, the imperialist states are shifting onto the shoulders of the peoples of those countries the burden of the economic crisis, continuing to

intensify their neocolonialist exploitations and pressing for conditions conducive to the infiltration of their economies by foreign capital, first and foremost by transnational corporations. The economic growth of the emergent countries is badly complicated and sometimes paralyzed altogether by the effect of such factors as the worsening of conditions for exchange on the world markets, particularly because of substantial drops in real raw materials prices, huge foreign indebtedness, tougher terms for credits and cuts in the funds set aside by developed capitalist states for developing countries. As a consequence, the gap between the level of the latter's economic development and that of developed capitalist states is widening and the poverty and hunger of hundreds of millions of people growing worse.

This situation curtails possibilities also for the solution of such major problems for humanity as a whole as the ensuring of food supply for the growing population of the world, the rational use of fuel and raw materials resources, the exploration and development of new energy sources, space and the world ocean and environmental protection.

The dangerous course of whipping up international tension is being countered by socialist countries, by the communist and working class movement, by other revolutionary and democratic forces, and by the mounting powerful antiwar movement, which express their resolve to put an end to aggressive policy, to remove the threat of nuclear war, to protect the independence and freedom of the peoples and to cooperate under conditions of peace and on the basis of equality. The blocking of mutually beneficial cooperation and of the restructuring of international economic relations on a fair and democratic basis also faces the growing opposition of the progressive public of the world at large, the movement of the nonaligned countries, other states, and realistic politicians and businessmen in capitalist countries, in particular, in the United States itself. This tendency is manifest in the fact that, despite pressure, many capitalist countries continue to extend economic contacts with socialist states.

As for the CEMA member countries, they resolutely denounce and reject the course of subverting the peaceful foundations of state-to-state relations and oppose every form of exploitation and any attempt at intervening in the internal affairs of other countries and exploiting economic contacts as a means of political pressure, regarding them as a gross violation of the commonly recognized norms of international law and the principles of the UN Charter and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

This course vis-a-vis the countries of the socialist community, as historical practice shows, is absolutely futile. Relying on their growing economic, scientific and technical potential and on the superiority of the socialist planned economy and strengthening their unity and cooperation, they possess everything they need to counter any pressure or discriminatory measures and any attempt to interfere with their development and participation in international cooperation.

Socialism is capable of effectively resolving the most complex national and international problems. As a result of the dedicated work of their peoples

and thanks to their close collaboration, the socialist countries, overcoming difficulties, have achieved outstanding results in the economy, culture, education and health care, in asserting equality and friendship among nations and in providing favorable conditions for the flourishing of the individual. These successes are proof of the visibility of the socialist system and its superiority over capitalism.

The example of the CEMA member countries, their achievements in building socialism and communism and the consolidation of relations of friendship and cooperation among them are exerting a great positive influence on world development. Consistently implementing in practice the principles of state-to-state relations of a new type in their mutual cooperation and also in contacts with other countries, the socialist states are making an effective contribution to the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis.

The participants in the conference stressed that the further development and improvement of cooperation and the extension of specialization and coproduction among the CEMA member countries would help resolve by joint efforts urgent problems of their economic development, in particular, meet their energy, raw materials and food needs, speed up the development and introduction of advanced technology and production processes, and improve the use of material and labor resources and production, scientific and technological potentials. This will facilitate the economic and social progress of every individual country, raise the material, cultural and intellectual standards of their population and strengthen the might, unity and cohesion of the socialist states.

At the same time the CEMA member countries are far from indifferent to the development of the political and economic work situation. They have a profound interest in having it improved, not only because it influences the fulfillment of their economic development plans and the normal growth, of their economic, scientific and technical contacts with other states. Socialism, which has asserted itself as the most progressive world system, intrinsically acts from positions of great responsibility for the future of mankind because its supreme goal is concern for man, for the good of man.

The leaders of the communist and workers parties and the heads of state and government of the CEMA member countries believe that it is necessary to work not for confrontation between states belonging to different social systems, not for raising ever new obstacles in relations between them but for a search of constructive ways to develop stable international political and economic realities and for the interests of all countries. They firmly believe that no world problems, including the historic dispute between socialism and capitalism, can be resolved militarily. The CEMA member countries also have been consistent opponents of economic isolationism and have perseveringly advocated broad mutually beneficial cooperation with other states, the normalization of international economic contacts and the removal of all sorts of barriers from the path of their development.

The experience of the past decade forcefully demonstrated the need for and usefulness of detente for all the peoples of the world. It contributed to



improvements in international relations and to the development of mutually beneficial economic contacts between countries. The lessening of the war threat made it possible to increase economic assistance to emergent countries. The developing states and socialist countries have unfolded and are carrying on the struggle for restructuring international economic relations on a fair and democratic basis.

The participants in the conference believe it important to consolidate and augment everything positive that was achieved in international relations during the 1970s and to work for stronger mutual trust and for the development of equal cooperation among states regardless of their social systems. This necessitates constructive efforts of all the states in both politics and the economy.

There is no more important task today than the task of safeguarding world peace and averting nuclear catastrophe. Priority is attached to ending the arms race, moving to arms reductions, and maintaining military-strategic equilibrium at progressively lower levels. These constitute the major condition for improving the world economic situation as well.

The participants in the conference are convinced that if the principle of equality and equal security is strictly observed, the nuclear arms race can be halted and states can initiate real nuclear disarmament measures. This calls for political will and for honest, equal and constructive dialogue respecting the security interest of all countries. It is on this basis that it will be possible to rid Europe completely of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons.

Major importance is also attached to the proposals of the socialist states to reach agreement without delay on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapon tests; on the prohibition of the militarization of space and the use of force in space and from space against targets on earth; on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons on a worldwide scale and, as a step towards that goal, on their elimination on the European continent.

The states represented at the conference draw attention to the exceptionally important proposal on concluding a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Treaty member states and the NATO member states. They strongly advocate that the nuclear powers which have not yet renounced the first use of nuclear weapons should do so.

In view of the task of resolving world economic problems, particular significance is being attached today to ensuring the earliest possible beginning of substantive talks between the Warsaw Treaty countries and the NATO countries to reduce military spending on the basis of a well-developed and concrete proposal recently put forward by the allied socialist countries in their address to the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Agreement on reducing military spending, naturally, should embrace all the states having major military potentials. The means released



as a result of reductions in military spending could be used for purposes of economic and social development, in particular, as assistance to developing countries.

These and other proposals of the socialist community on detente and disarmament are well-known. The CEMA countries are prepared actively to participate in their practical implementation as well as in the implementation of constructive initiatives put forward by other states.

The successful completion of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe could play a great role in lessening the threat of war and scaling down armed confrontation.

In international economic relations practice demands mutually beneficial and equal cooperation between all countries. Otherwise no solid material base for the consolidation and extension of detente can be created.

Faithful to the principles of peaceful coexistence, the leaders of the communist and workers parties and heads of state and government of the CEMA member countries address all the peoples and leaders of state and government with an appeal to make energetic efforts to extend international economic cooperation.

The proposals put forward by socialist countries at the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance, at the United Nations and at other international forums to this effect are in force. By way of extending these proposals, the participants in the conference call for carrying out a program of action to improve and to establish trust in that most important area of relations between governments.

It is necessary first and foremost to achieve the practical implementation of all the recommendations and agreements aimed at promoting mutually beneficial and fruitful economic cooperation that have been worked out by the joint efforts of states and reflected in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, in the final document adopted at the Madrid meeting of the states participating in that conference, and also in the charter of economic rights and duties of states, in the declaration and the program of action on establishing a new international economic order and in other UN resolutions.

Every method of economic aggression, such as the use or threat of embargo, boycott or trade, credit and technological blockade, should be excluded from the practice of international practices.

It is necessary strictly to observe in economic relations among all states the principles of respect for national independence and sovereignty, noninterference in internal affairs, nonuse of force or threat of its use, complete equality, respect for national interests and the right of every nation to decide its destiny, mutual benefit, nondiscrimination and most-favored-nation treatment.

The CEMA members countries are consistent champions of effective solutions and actions aimed at removing any exploitation from international economic relations, at ensuring unimpeded international scientific and technical cooperation, at removing discrimination, artificial obstacles and unfair exchanges from trade relations, at establishing just and economically sound correlations between prices for raw materials, food and manufactured products and to this end at tightening control over the operations of transnational monopolies. They advocate the regimenting of monetary-financial relations, oppose the policy of high interest rates and champion the normalization of terms under which credits are granted and paid back so that those terms, particularly with relation to the indebtedness of the developing countries, should not be used as a means of political pressure and interference in internal affairs.

The participants in the conference reiterate the firm intention of their countries to develop fruitful trade, economic, scientific and technical contacts with all the socialist, developing and developed capitalist states willing to do so. They believe it useful to extend those contacts first and foremost on the basis of long-term programs and agreements and to employ different mutually beneficial forms of cooperation, in particular, cooperation in technical equipment and construction of projects, industrial cooperation, joint work on scientific and technical problems, etc.

The CEMA member countries stand for more energetic use of potentials for the development of business cooperation with capitalist states and also with their businesses and companies. Much importance is attached in this respect to broadening economic, scientific and technical contacts between European states in the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act and the accords reached at the Madrid meeting. Mutually beneficial cooperation among them could contribute to broader trade, to the supply of energy and raw materials, to the acceleration of technical progress, to the development of international transportation, to environmental protection and to a rise in employment in countries with a high level of joblessness.

The CEMA member countries advocate the establishment of mutually beneficial relations between the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance and economic organizations of developed capitalist and developing countries. In this context they reiterate their readiness to conclude an appropriate agreement between the CEMA and the EEC with a view to facilitating the further expansion of trade and economic contacts existing between the member countries of those organizations.

The leaders of the communist and workers parties and the heads of state and government of the CEMA member countries believe it imperative to intensify work to restructure international economic relations on a fair and democratic basis and to establish a new international economic order.

Noting with satisfaction the increased importance of the movement of nonaligned countries as a powerful factor of struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism--the forces of war and aggression--and the efforts made in that direction since the 6th nonaligned summit in Havana, the

participants in the conference express their solidarity with the resolutions and message of the 7th Conference of the Heads of State and Government of Nonaligned Countries in New Delhi, aimed at resolving the vital problems of our time--the struggle for stronger world peace, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, national independence and the ensuring of the economic and social development of every country.

The CEMA member countries support the progressive demands of the developing states in the struggle for economic decolonization, for ensuring complete sovereignty over their natural and other resources and their economic activity, for their broad and equal participation in solving international economic problems, for an end to the outflow of capital and the drain of skilled personnel, and for the unconditioned application of the general system of preference with a view to the need to counter the deterioration of the economic situation of the developing countries and to contribute to their progress.

The eradication of backwardness, the gradual closing of the gap between economic development levels and the provision of conditions for the harmonious expansion of international contacts in the economy, science and technology constitute one of the fundamental factors of economic stability and the improvement of the international political climate.

International economic relations should be restructured in a way enabling all the countries of the world to develop comprehensively their economic potentials and to advance on the road of development under conditions of peace, justice and mutual cooperation.

The CEMA member countries will continue to do what they can to render economic and technical assistance to states which have won freedom and independence in their efforts to develop their national economies.

Since responsibility for the age-old backwardness of the developing countries is borne by the former mother countries and is inseparable from the policy pursued by the imperialist states nowadays and from the activities of international monopolies, the CEMA member countries view as perfectly justified the demands of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin American that those who are to blame for the difficulties suffered by those countries should expand considerably the transfer of resources by way of compensating for the damage caused as a result of colonial plunder and neocolonialist exploitation, reduce the burden of the indebtedness of the developing states and ease their access on beneficial terms to international credit sources.

The participants in the conference reiterate the need to enhance the role of the United Nations and organizations of its system as a major forum for pooling the efforts of states to strengthen peace and international security and to contribute to the solution of vital world problems. To this end the CEMA member countries are prepared to continue energetically to contribute to their work. They advocate the early start within the framework of the United Nations of global talks on the more important international economic problems

in accordance with the resolutions of that organization, with the participation of all states and with due regard for their legitimate interests.

The CEMA member countries will cooperate in the implementation of the proposals put forward in the present declaration with all those who have an interest in strengthening international peace and security and improving international economic relations. They expect from other states manifestations of similar goodwill, mutual understanding and desire for joint actions and are prepared to consider any constructive proposal in this context.

The participants in the conference are convinced that today it is more necessary than ever before for all the parliaments and governments for the world public at large and for all sensible people to join their efforts to safeguard and strengthen peace, curb the arms race, promote disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, and normalize international economic relations in the interests of all countries and peoples.

For the People's Republic of Bulgaria:

Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria

For the Hungarian People's Republic:

Janos Kadar, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party

For the Socialist Republic of Vietnam:

Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam

For the German Democratic Republic:

Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic

For the Republic of Cuba:

Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, deputy chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba

For the Mongolian People's Republic:

Yumjaagiyn Tsedenbal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and chairman of the Presidium of the Great People's Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic



For the Polish People's Republic:

Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic

For the Socialist Republic of Romania:

Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Konstantin Chernenko, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet

For the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic:

Gustav Husak, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, president of the Czechoslovakia Socialist Republic

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15

IN THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE

LD161400 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84)  
pp 36-41

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has passed the decree "On the 40th Anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet People in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45."

The decision notes that 9 May 1985 is the 44th anniversary of the day that the battle, unprecedented in history for its scale and ferocity against the most reactionary shock forces of imperialism, the fascism of Hitler, which set down the aim of destroying the first socialist state in the world and establishing world domination, ended in victory.

For the Soviet Union, it was a just war of liberation. In inflicting a crushing defeat on the enemy, the Soviet people and its Armed Forces, under the leadership of the communist party, defended the freedom and independence of the socialist homeland, and upheld the cause of the October Revolution. They made a decisive contribution to the victory over fascist Germany and its allies, to the liberation of the peoples of Europe from fascist bondage, to saving world civilization. They fulfilled their patriotic and internationalist duty with honor. In this lies one of their greatest services to mankind.

The decades that have passed since then have shown even more clearly and fully the worldwide historical significance of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. The routing of German fascism and then of Japanese militarism had a most profound influence on the entire course of world development. Favorable conditions were created for the struggle of the mass of the working people for their social and national liberation. The positions of progressive democratic peace-loving forces have been strengthened. The influence of communist and workers' parties has grown. A world socialist system has arisen and is developing successfully. The process of the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism has speeded up, ending with its failure.

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War in all fullness revealed the advantages of socialism, its enormous economic, sociopolitical and spiritual possibilities. This was a victory of the Soviet state created by the great Lenin, the most front-ranking social order, socialist and

economic system. The Great Patriotic War convincingly demonstrated the monolithic unity of the party and the people, the indestructibility of the union of the working class, collective farm peasantry and the working intelligentsia, the friendship and fraternity of the peoples of the USSR.

The victory in the Great Patriotic War confirmed the mighty vital force of Marxist-Leninist ideology. Deep ideological conviction, unbounded faith in the righteousness of the great Leninist cause, served as an inexhaustible source of spiritual strength for the Soviet people, their moral and political cohesion.

The victory in the Great Patriotic War demonstrated the superiority of Soviet military science and art of war, the high level of the strategic leadership, and the combat skill of our military cadres. In combat actions, the USSR Armed Forces destroyed Hitler's plan for a blitzkrieg, and then having taken the initiative, achieved a fundamental turning point in the war and effected the defeat of the enemy. In the fierce fighting with fascism, selfless devotion to the party and people, love for the homeland, and mass heroism were manifested by the men of the Army and Navy and volunteer corps fighters. A significant contribution to the victory over the fascist invaders was made by Soviet partisans and the underground.

The working people in the rear, workers, collective farmers, scientists, engineers and designers achieved great feats during the war years. With their selfless work, they won the unprecedented battle for metal and bread, fuel and raw materials, and for the creation of powerful Soviet weapons. Soviet women demonstrated unprecedented tenacity and heroism in work. The Leninist Komsomol was a vital help to the party in solving tasks on the front and in the rear. Workers in Soviet culture, writers, poets, composers, artists, painters, film workers, and journalists earned the people's high esteem. Through their works, they cultivated the ardent patriotism and courage of the Soviet people.

The Leninist communist party was the inspirer and organizer of the victory of the Soviet people. By its multifaceted activity, it ensured the firm unity of the political, state and military leadership, and of the army and people of the front and of the rear. At its call, the whole country rose in the battle to the death with fascism. The communist party was a real fighting party. Communists were in the most difficult and decisive areas of the fight against the enemy. Through personal example and passionate party oratory, they inspired and led the Soviet people to victory.

The decision stresses that fighting selflessly against the fascist invaders were fighting men from the military formations and partisan armies and units of Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia, as well as patriots from Bulgaria, Romania, Albania and Hungary, participants in the resistance movement and antifascist underground. The ranks of the liberation struggle were led by communists, faithful sons of their peoples and ardent internationalists. A great contribution was made to achieving victory in World War II by the peoples and armies of the United States, Great Britain, France, China and other members of the anti-Hitlerite coalition.

The lessons of the Great Patriotic War are of lasting significance. The main one is that one must struggle against war before it has begun. The experience of history teaches us that in order to defend peace, we need united, coordinated and active deeds by all peace-loving forces against the aggressive adventurist course of imperialism. It is essential to intensify the vigilance of the peoples and to defend and multiply the gains of socialism.

This is of particular importance now when reactionary imperialist circles, and primarily the United States, have declared a new "crusade" against socialism, ignoring the lessons of history, and are trying to achieve military superiority over the USSR and its allies, spiraling the arms race to an uncontrollable degree and striving to dictate their will to sovereign states from a position of strength. Deployment of new U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries, increasing military preparations by the United States in the Far East and the intensifying militarization of Japan are causing serious alarm. The growing military threat on the part of the United States and its NATO allies calls for constant strengthening of our homeland's defense capability, and the combat might of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The Soviet Union, together with the fraternal socialist countries, consistently supports removing the threat of war, curbing the arms race, and preserving peace. The communist party and Soviet state are doing everything possible to defend peace, prevent a nuclear catastrophe and not allow any disruption of the military-strategic balance of forces that has been reached. The cause of the preservation of peace is reliably serviced by the fraternal union of the peoples and armies of the Warsaw Pact countries and the successfully developing comprehensive cooperation among socialist states belonging to CEMA.

Owing to the firm and consistent policies of the communist party, the Soviet people have lived in conditions of peace for 4 decades now. The economy, the political system of Soviet society, and socialist democracy are developing steadily. The state of all the people is growing stronger. The material and cultural standard of the people's lives are rising. The society of developed socialism was created and improved by the selfless labor of all generations of Soviet people.

The victory in the Great Patriotic War was won by the Soviet people in the name of peace and life on earth. For its deliverance from the threat of fascist enslavement, for its liberty, mankind is to a large extent obligated to the world's first socialist state and to its historic victory over the foe.

The CPSU Central Committee has decided to mark 9 May 1985, the 40th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, as a national holiday.

Party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the political organs of the army and navy are recommended to organize at industrial enterprises, construction sites, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, institutions and educational establishments, in military units and on naval vessels and in all labor collective broad ideological and mass political work to explain the world



historic importance of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, the decisive contribution of the Soviet Union to the rout of fascist Germany and militarist Japan and the liberating missions of the Soviet Armed Forces, to reveal in depth the role of the CPSU as the organizer and inspirer of the victory of the foe, the mass heroism of the Soviet people, the men of the army and navy, partisans and participants in the underground and the workers in the rear.

All means of agitational and propaganda work should be used to show clearly and convincingly the fruitful and purposeful activity of the CPSU to perfect developed socialism, to strengthen the economic and defensive might of our homeland, the sociopolitical, ideological and international unity of the Soviet society, the party's concern for enhancing the party's welfare, to reveal comprehensively the peace-loving foreign political course of the communist party and the Soviet state, the strength of the positions of world socialism and the active efforts of the fraternal communist and workers parties and all peace-loving forces against the threat of war.

They must unmask the antipopular, reactionary essence of imperialism, the militaristic plans of the United States and its NATO allies, revanchism and Japanese militarism and give a resolute and well-argued rebuff to our ideological opponents and to all sorts of falsifiers of the history of World War II.

Party, trade union and Komsomol organizations must make full use of the preparations for and the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War for the further intensification of the labor and political activity of the Soviet people in the implementation of the decisions of the 26th Party Congress and of the subsequent plenums of the CPSU Central Committee for the development of socialist competition for the completion of the tasks of 1984 and the five-year plan as a whole, to support and develop in every way valuable labor initiatives aimed at providing a worthy welcome for the festival of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War and to explain constantly that in contemporary conditions the fulfillment of planned tasks, conscientious productive labor, a high organizational standard and discipline are not only a civic obligation but also the patriotic duty of every Soviet person and every labor collective.

The preparations for the anniversary of the great victory should contribute to the strengthening of all ideological education work. In conditions whereby aggressive imperialist circles are whipping up tension and systematically organizing hostile ideological campaigns and sabotage against the Soviet Union and the fraternal countries of socialism, ever increasing importance is assumed by the education of the working people in a spirit of Soviet patriotism, proletarian socialist internationalism and friendship among the peoples of the USSR. There must be formed in every Soviet person a clearly defined class attitude, great political vigilance, feelings of irreconcilability with imperialism, and conviction of the rightness and invincibility of socialism.

An important task is the propaganda of the glorious combat traditions of the communist party, the Soviet people and their armed forces, and the

strengthening of military-patriotic and mass defense work. Soviet people, and first and foremost young people, must possess military skills and be prepared to defend the socialist fatherland.

The CPSU Central Committee instructed the central committees of the union republican communist parties, party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, the councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, executive committees of soviets of people's deputies, ministries, departments, trade union and Komsomol organizations to pay increased attention to war and labor veterans, to enhance the role they play in all spheres of economic and public life, to involve them more widely in bringing up the younger generation, to show constant concern for those who took part in the Great Patriotic War and to monitor the granting to those who took part in the war the benefits and privileges established by existing legislation. Particular attention is focused on the further improvement of material and domestic conditions for war invalids and families of those who were killed, including providing them with housing and medical services, which are of primary importance.

The union republic communist parties central committees, kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, political organs of the army and navy, ministries and departments, councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, executive committees of soviets of working people's deputies, the AUCCTU, the Komsomol Central Committee, the USSR DOSAAF Central Committee, the board of the All-Union Society for Knowledge, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, the Soviet Committee of War Veterans, the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, and the creative unions are charged with the task of drafting and implementing specific measures for the preparation and celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War.

Between 3 and 9 May 1985, solemn meetings devoted to the 40th anniversary of victory will be held. In the capitals of the union republics, in kray, oblast, okrug and rayon centers, in towns, at industrial enterprises and kolkhozes and sovkhozes, in institutions, education establishments, in military units and on board ships celebrations to honor veterans of the Great Patriotic War will be organized.

On 8 May 1985 in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses a solemn meeting of representatives of the working people of the city of Moscow and servicemen of the Moscow Garrison devoted to the 40th anniversary of victory will be held.

The initiative of the labor collectives of the hero cities to hold an all-union vigil of commemoration dedicated to the 40th anniversary of victory has been upheld.

On 9 May, wreaths will be laid at monuments and obelisks and on the graves of servicemen from the army and navy, partisans and heroes of the underground who fell in the struggle against the fascist German invaders and the Japanese militarists.

It is recommended that the USSR Ministry of Culture, the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy and the creative unions create new artistic and documentary works about the heroic exploits of the Soviet people and their Armed Forces in the Great Patriotic War and about the Soviet servicemen who are the heirs to victory.

A joint plenum of creative unions and organizations devoted to the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945 will be held in April 1985.

The editorial offices of the central newspapers and magazines, the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade, TASS, the NOVOSTI news agency, the All-Union Copyright Agency, Political Literature Publishing House, and the CPSU Central Committee Plakat [poster] Publishing House are required to ensure broad coverage of the preparation and celebration of the 40th anniversary of the victory and the production in the languages of the peoples of the USSR of books, posters, albums and other material showing the world historic importance of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War. They are also to ensure in good time the publication of the best artistic, documentary and memoir works about the war provided for by the plans of the publishing houses.

The USSR Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of Defense and the Main Political Administration of the Soviet army and navy are instructed to hold a scientific conference in the first half of 1985 devoted to the 40th anniversary of victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War and to the defeat of militarist Japan.

In May 1985, the Komsomol Central Committee, the USSR DOSAAF Central Committee and the Soviet War Veterans Committee will hold an all-union rally of winners of the youth march through places of revolutionary, combat and labor glory in the Hero City of Tula.

The USSR Council of Minister Committee for Physical Culture and Sport, the AUCCTU, the Komsomol Central Committee and the USSR DOSAAF Central Committee, jointly with the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, the USSR Ministry of Education and the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, are advised to hold the first all-union youth games in hero cities, dedicated to the 40th anniversary of victory, in the second quarter of 1985.

The holding of an aviation sports festival devoted to the 40th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War in Moscow, at Tushino Airport, is planned for May 1985.

The USSR State Committee for Cinematography is instructed to devote an all-union 1985 film festival to the 40th anniversary of victory, and to invite representatives of the foreign cinema to it.

In April-May 1985, the USSR Ministry of Culture and the USSR Union of Artists will hold an all-union artistic exhibition entitled "40 Years Since the Great Victory" in the central exhibition hall in Moscow.

The USSR Ministry of Culture, the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, the USSR Union of Writers, the USSR Union of Composers, the USSR Union of Artists, the All-Russian Theatrical Society and the Main Political Administration of the Soviet army and navy are recommended to time the conferral of medals, named after Fadeyev, Aleksandrov, Dovzhenko, Grekov and other outstanding cultural figures, for the best works on a military-patriotic theme to coincide with the 40th anniversary of victory.

The All-Union Society for Knowledge is instructed to hold sociopolitical readings dedicated to the 40th anniversary of victory in Moscow, in the capitals of the union republics, in kray and oblast centers, and in towns and rayons.

The USSR Ministry of Culture, the AUCCTU and the Komsomol Central Committee are recommended to organize lectures, creative soirees and meetings with war veterans in clubs, libraries, museums and parks.

An all-union review of amateur artistic works and a competition for the best song dedicated to the 40th anniversary of victory will be held.

The CPSU Central Committee expressed its conviction that Soviet people will rally even more closely around the Leninist party and mark the 40th anniversary of the victory in the Great Patriotic War with fresh achievements in all sectors of economic and cultural construction; and by their selfless labor, they will make a worthy contribution to strengthening the economic and defensive might of the socialist motherland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15



## THE NATURE OF CONTRADICTIONS IN THE SOCIALIST ECONOMY AND THE FORMS OF THEIR SOLUTION

PM191000 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84)  
pp 42-53

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Kulikov under the rubric "Problems of the Improvement of Developed Socialism"]

[Text] Bringing the system of the planned management of social production and the economic machinery into line with the conditions of the initial stage of developed socialism is an organic element of the process of improving our entire social system. The successful solution of this most important task presupposes the systematic utilization in the economic machinery of those forms of the manifestations of socialism's objective laws which ensure the movement and resolution of the contradictions inherent in the socialist economy. Inadequate cognition of the economic contradictions characteristic of socialism is a substantial obstacle to the scientific elaboration of the fundamental directions in improving the machinery of socialist economic management.

### I

The question of contradictions relates to the very essence of the dialectical method of cognition of nature and society. "The coexistence of two mutually contradictory sides, their struggle and their fusion into a new category," K. Marx emphasized, "constitute the essence of dialectical movement" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 4, p 136), Lenin's renowned fragment "On the Question of Dialectics" begins with the words: "The division of the whole and the cognition of its contradictory elements...is the essence (one of the 'essences,' one of the fundamental, if not the fundamental characteristics or features) of dialectics" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 29, p 316). Proceeding from the premise that only such an approach offers the key to discovering "the 'self-movement' of everything in existence," V. I. Lenin wrote: "The condition for perceiving all processes in the world in their 'self-movement,' in their spontaneous development, in their living life, is the cognition of these processes as a unity of opposites. Development in the 'struggle' of opposites" (ibid., p 317).

With the emergence and development of socialist production relations, the contradictions, which are not of an antagonistic nature, appropriate to those relations also appear. Lenin particularly emphasized this fact. "Antagonism and contradiction are certainly not the same thing. The former will disappear, the latter will remain under socialism" ("Lenin Anthology," XI, p 357).

The proposition about the preservation of contradictions under socialism is of enormous, fundamental significance. Over a long period of time, however, the profound meaning of this idea of Lenin's was not sufficiently disclosed. Views became widespread which maintained that the source of self-movement changes radically with the transition to socialism: "Unity" supposedly becomes such a source in addition to contradictions or even instead of them. Even if contradictions under socialism did remain the object of special attention to researchers, the stress, as a rule, was placed not on the immanent (inherent) contradictions of the new social system (often these were altogether ignored or even directly rejected) but on contradictions between the objectively urgent requirements of the development of production and economic practice, contradictions linked with survivals and recurrences of the past in the present and with difficulties, anomalies, and negative phenomena in the socialist society's economic life.

Contradictions of this kind did, and unfortunately still do, exist in our economy. But they cannot be considered a source of socialist society's progress in the literal meaning of the word. Economic practice which does not accord with the requirements of socialism's objective economic laws is capable of giving rise to situations where these laws begin to act "like the forces of nature...blindly, violently, destructively" (F. Engels), which leads to disruption of the normal course of reproduction and considerable material and moral damage. The resolution of contradictions here lies in overcoming negative phenomena, for example, in extirpating shortcomings in economic practice on the basis of the deeper cognition of economic laws and effective mastery of the machinery of their operation and in consistently adhering to the fundamental principles of socialism in the spheres of production and distribution.

The proposition regarding "unity" as the driving force of our society's development and the assignment of all the contradictions that exist under socialism in the "negative" category are closely linked. This is because if this assignment reflects the actual reality, it is completely logical to claim that something else must be the source of development in the place of contradictions.

These views were not conducive to the revelation of socialism's immanent contradictions and, furthermore, created a major methodological barrier in the way of this. And although more attention has begun to be paid in the last few years to research into the immanent contradictions of socialist production, much more still remains to be done. The absolute universality of the fundamental law of dialectics means that there is not a single production relation, nor a single economic law which does not contain contradictions. The researcher's task is to reveal them in their characteristic forms of movement.

The contradictions immanent in socialism serve as a true source and driving force, a stimulus for the onward development of social production. Understanding of this fact encourages a quest for the creative potential embodied in the contradictions specific to socialism, and the revelation of the specific forms of the movement and solution of these contradictions in conformity with the specific features on the contemporary stage.

It is exceptionally important also to bear in mind the following: The nonantagonist contradictions immanent in socialism--unless they are studied and duly taken into consideration in the practice of economic management--can generate negative processes and serious collisions and emerge as "negative" contradictions leading to disruptions of the reproduction process and losses.

An orientation toward the revelation of the contradiction in each production relation and each economic law and the disclosure of each contradiction not per se but as "operational," as a source of the development and universal connection of economic processes--this is the main thing that is required today from economic science in the field of research into the contradictions of socialism. This is the essential condition for intensifying the link between theory and economic practice. This is the aspect of the matter to which special attention was devoted at the CPSU Central Committee June 1983 Plenum. "It is well-known that the question of contradictions as the driving force of social development," Comrade K. U. Chernenko stressed, "is of substantial significance for theory and practice...What is needed today is a comprehensive study of the nonantagonistic contradictions characteristic of mature socialism and the specific features of their solution under the conditions of the Soviet society's strengthening sociopolitical and ideological unity."

## II

There are certain grounds for the underestimation of the role of contradictions under conditions of unity which, in one way or another, "provoke" researchers to absolutize this unity. Marx discovered one of these grounds in relation to the essentially antagonistic economic system of the bourgeois society. The actual moment of the mutual assumption and actual mutual transition of the two aspects of a given production relation give the impression that there is no substantial difference or opposition between these two aspects and creates the idea that they are absolutely identical. Drawing attention to this fact, Marx wrote: "Wherever an economic relationship--and therefore also the categories expressing it--contains opposites and is a contradiction, or actually a unity of contradictions, he (the reference is to James Mill--V. K.) emphasizes the element of the unity of the opposites and rejects the opposites. He transforms the unity of opposites into the direct identity of these opposites" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 26, chapter III, p 86).

There are other, deeper grounds for the absolutization of unity in nonantagonistic social systems. In these systems in the first place, the "polarization" of opposites is not "hostile" or acutely expressed, nor does it always increase. Second, the opposites here do not simply assume one another

nor do they simply effect a mutual transition. They travel in the same direction, and their unity does not weaken but actually strengthens. The following is no less important: confronting class forces do not lie behind the nonantagonistic opposites. The above-mentioned facts automatically "push" the research toward the conclusion that here the opposite aspects are gradually fusing into something absolutely identical and that unity is "freed" from contradictoriness. In actual fact the growth of the element of unity of opposites in the nonantagonistic system is an endless process which does not result in their total fusion or the formation of a "direct identity."

To proclaim unity to be an independent source of development is tantamount to isolating unity from contradictions and looking upon them as a "predetermined sequence" of given factors. In actual fact unity not only necessarily contains contradictions, but is actually attained only through the interaction of opposites. And under the conditions of socialism there is no other way to attain unity but through the interaction of opposites.

It is, for example, well known that the interests of the society of working people as a whole, the interests of labor collectives, and the interests of individual workers are identical. Furthermore, the specific feature of the unity of interests here lies in the fact that these interests have a common direction and lack antagonism.

This fact is, of course, exceptionally important, but does not in any way cancel the fact that the unity of the above-mentioned interests is each time actually attained only through their interaction and by implementing each set of interests as something relatively special in the process of this interaction. The absolutization of any of these interests to the detriment of the others violates their unity. It is possible to subordinate production to the interests of society only by satisfying the collective and the individual interests. The opposite is also correct: The implementation of collective and individual interests "works" to consolidate the unity of interests only when it is channeled in the direction of the social interest. "The interests of society as a whole," Yu. V. Andropov wrote, "are the most important guideline for the development of an economy based on socialist ownership. It does not, however, follow from this that socialism, for the sake of the idea of the common good, suppresses or ignores individual or local interests or the specific needs of different social groups.... One of the most important tasks in the improvement of our national economic machinery is to ensure that these interests are accurately taken into account, that they are optimally combined with the interests of the whole people, and that they are thus utilized as a driving force of the Soviet economy's growth..."

Unity outside the interaction of different and opposite aspects, in other words a "noncontradictory" unity, does not exist from the dialectical point of view. It is precisely in view of this fact that the alternatives posed in the following question are wrong: Is "unity" or "contradiction" the source of development? Under the conditions of socialism this source is the interaction of contradictory aspects leading the consolidation of their organic unity.

In order to understand a contradiction as a source of development, substantial significance attaches to the question of the essence of its solution. There



is obviously some point in differentiating between two fundamental methods of solution. One of them is by creating new forms for the internal contradiction's expression and forms for its movement, during which the opposite aspects are maintained and developed. The other one is by removing the contradiction in question, which presupposes the elimination of the phenomenon of which this contradiction is an immanent element. Marx described the first method of resolving contradictions as follows: "The process of commodities exchange contains contradictory and mutually exclusive relationships. Commodity development does not remove these contradictions but creates a form for their movement. This, generally speaking, is the method whereby actual contradictions are resolved. For example, the fact that one body constantly falls toward another and just as constantly draws away from the latter contains a contradiction. Ellipsis is one of the forms of movement during which this contradiction is simultaneously implemented and resolved" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, pp 113-114). It is exchange value and money that are the form which resolves the internal contradictions of commodities while maintaining and developing those contradictions. In order to resolve these contradictions in the sense of removing them it is necessary to overcome the commodity form of production and consequently to eliminate the conditions that generate it.

In precisely the same way monopoly and state monopoly capitalism represent the essence of the form of movement and solution of capitalism's basic contradiction while maintaining and exacerbating it. In order to remove this contradiction it is necessary to liquidate the capitalist mode of production itself.

The first method of resolving contradictions is typical primarily of internal formation development, while the second is typical of changes of socioeconomic formations. Hence it is clear that the analysis of the first method of resolving contradictions must occupy a special position in the political economy of socialism.

Despite all the substantial differences between the two methods of resolving contradictions, there is no absolute dividing line between these two methods. For example, the solution of the basic contradiction of capitalism during the transition to socialism within the framework of a specific segment of historic development should be assigned to the second category. But from the viewpoint of the history of human society as a whole, this transition represents the finding of the forms of movement of the contradiction between production forces and production relations under the conditions of the former's new state.

On the other hand, the first method of resolving contradictions includes as a necessary direct component the removal of some elements and the emergence of others. The development of the form of value, for example, presupposes the replacement of its different varieties.

The solution of contradictions by finding the forms of their movement means their reproduction. This reproduction is not actually in forms absolutely identical to the original state, but in a form that is changed to a certain extent. The elucidation of this fact is a very important condition for

understanding contradictions as an internal source of development. Changes in production forces, for example, presuppose changes in the social mode of their functioning, in other words in production relations, which, in its turn, opens up new possibilities for the development of production forces. Each of the opposite aspects has an influence on the other, thus ensuring social progress as a whole.

The positive changes which occur during this process encompass all "strata" of the system of production relations and not just the specific economic forms of management which make up the meaning of the term "economic machinery." The improvement of this machinery, on the one hand, reflects the changes due to occur at deeper "levels" of the system of production relations, while on the other hand it serves as the obligatory means of implementing these changes.

The point in question reveals yet another aspect of the "effect" of the problem of the reproduction of contradictions (in the altered state which has been mentioned) on questions of improving the economic machinery. The thesis that the element of the stability and congruence of this machinery with itself are predetermined by the nature of socialism's economic laws, while all changes are predetermined by the specific conditions of economic activity at this or that stage of socialist society's development has become widespread in political-economic literature. In reality the fact that economic laws and their immanent contradictions are reproduced in an altered state objectively predetermines not only the element of stability in the economic machinery but also the main element of its evolution and development.

The absolutization of the second method of resolving contradictions--by means of removing them--is one of the methodological sources of the ideas that it is possible to replace contradictions as the driving force in the development of socialist production relations by unity. What is ignored here is the fact that the most important and, at the same time, most complex thing is to ensure the combination of opposites in economic practice. However, this is the goal to which Lenin's works orientate us. "But we have, nevertheless, studied Marxism a little," Lenin wrote, "and learned how and when opposites can and must be combined, and the main thing is that in the 3.5 years of our revolution we have on several occasions practically combined opposites" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 42, p 211).

The combination of opposites runs contrary to "common sense." When it encounters something contradictory, "common sense is inclined to seek what it deems to be a natural solution--to eliminate one of the opposite sides and therefore the contradiction itself. In real life, for example, it is not difficult to find instances when the economic independence granted to enterprises leads to breaches of plan targets by them and to actions which are not in accordance with the interest of the whole people. The solution which suggests itself and is seemingly completely obvious is to intensify centralism at the expense of enterprises' independence and eliminate this independence.

There are also equally well-known instances where centralism leads to fettering of the initiative of the economy's "primary links." The solution seems simple--weaken or even eliminate centralism and correspondingly strengthen enterprises' independence in economic activity.

Neither of these propositions transcends the bounds of commonplace reasoning and both share the same methodological base--the rejection of the "combination of opposites." Instead of taking the path of seeking forms of combining centralism with the independence of economic links whereby it is not in the interest of lower links to violate the instructions given from above nor in the interest of higher links to curtail initiative at local levels, what is proposed is a willful solution which is neither scientifically substantiated nor leads to the desired result--the enhancement of economic efficiency at all levels of our economic organism's operations. This is because no one has yet succeeded in removing one of the opposite sides if the contradiction lies in the very nature of the subject. Furthermore, if a form for organically combining the opposites is not found, it is possible that the latter may enter a state of serious collision. "It is, after all, possible to combine these opposite concepts in such a way," Lenin emphasized, "as to produce a cacophony, but it is also possible to produce a symphony" (op. cit., vol 42, p 211).

This quotation from Lenin applies directly to the contradictions connected with distribution according to labor. But it is also methodologically significant for the analysis of all the economic contradictions characteristic of socialism. At the same time this proposition provides the key to understanding the point that the harmony of interests which is organically inherent in socialism certainly does not preclude contradictions. This harmony is attained whenever a nonantagonist contradiction's form of movement has been discovered and whenever the organic combination of opposites has been ensured in accordance with the prevailing specific conditions. This is the "symphony" of which Lenin spoke. Its attainment at the same time makes it harder to understand the fact that internal contradictions not only necessarily occur, but also inevitably serve as a source of development.

The complexity of understanding the problem of "combination of opposites" is compounded by the fact that an internal contradiction cannot be resolved once and for all time. Since changes constantly occur in its aspects, the forms of their combination must also change. And if matters were otherwise, contradictions could not serve as the driving force in the development of phenomena.

The planned functioning and development of the socialist economic system means that the conscious scientific activity of people united within the labor association becomes a specific method of the movement and solution of contradictions. In this process the purposeful influence of the association on changes in one of the opposites. At the same time, the quest for such forms must be based on Lenin's proposition that complete conformity "does not exist even in the simplest natural phenomena" (op. cit., vol 26, p 153). Nor is the planned method of resolving contradictions capable of ensuring "absolute conformity." The existence of "elements of disparity" or "partial disparity" is therefore a completely natural state which, given the prompt discovery of such elements, not only does not create any particular obstacles but is actually "inbuilt" in the machinery for resolving contradictions and serves as an added incentive for making changes in the "lagging" side.



Matters are different if changes of this kind are not implemented in good time. In such cases the elements of disparity increase and become artificially intensified, which leads to more or less serious national economic imbalances, disruption of the normal flow of the reproduction process, and economic losses.

If resolute countermeasures are not taken, the nonantagonistic contradictions may give rise to serious collisions and can at any moment turn from a source of the development of socialist production into an obstacle to that development.

Such a development of events certainly does not arise from the nature of the planned method of resolving contradictions. On the contrary, the advantage of this method consists in the fact that it is capable of preventing spontaneous, still less destructive, forms of expression of contradictions. Neither slumps in production, nor unemployment, nor inflation are immanent in socialism. Hypertrophied elements of disparity, with all the resultant consequences, can occur in the socialist economy if serious errors are committed in planned management: if the effect of objective economic laws is not taken into consideration; if forms appropriate to one stage of development but not appropriate to the conditions of the new stage are preserved; if purposeful changes to one of the opposite sides are not accompanied by the necessary changes to the other, in other words, if the harmony of opposite sides is not ensured.

Sharp disparities between elements of the system certainly apply to the contradictions existing under socialism. But this is only one of the possible (and by no means law-governed) forms of the outward expression of the contradictions immanent in the socialist economy. Vigorous and purposeful actions by all elements of the system of plan management to overcome the contradictions connected with disparities of this type which sometimes emerge are, of course, necessary and constitute a mandatory element of the implementation of the party's economic policy. These actions, however, are only one element in a process, the essence of which is the quest for forms of the movement of internal, immanent contradictions, which, unlike "negative" contradictions, are not removed but undergo expanded reproduction on a new basis.

On the grounds that the above-mentioned "negative" contradictions do not belong to the category of contradictions immanent in socialism, it would seem possible to draw the conclusion that they do not fall within the sphere of political economy's competence but should be the exclusive object of attention of...investigative and control organs. But such scientific snobbery would be harmful from both the theoretical and the practical points of view. In actual fact, immanent and "negative" contradictions are closely linked: the former, objectively predetermining the complexity of economic processes, create thereby a real possibility of mistakes in management decisions, while the latter results in an artificial intensification of the polarization of internal opposites and impart spontaneous and destructive forms to the outward expression of the correlation of these opposites. One of the most important tasks of the political economy of socialism is therefore to reveal scientifically in the process of analyzing the contradictions immanent in



socialism the negative consequences of their operation which are possible and even inevitable if forms of their implementation and solution appropriate to the given stage of developments are not discovered in good time. If such consequences are already taking place, the political economic analysis must explain which internal contradiction these consequences are an external expression of. This is a mandatory condition for discovering the most effective ways to eliminate "negative" contradictions.

### III

Many elements of the economic machinery are predetermined by the fundamental attributes of the basic and universal relationship in the economic system of socialism--the directly social and planned form of production.

It is therefore clear that, when analyzing the ways to improve the methods of economic management, fundamental significance attaches to revealing the contradictions immanent in the form in question. These contradictions are, of course, certainly not the only ones in the system of economic contradictions under socialism, but the mandatory first stage in the theoretical revelation of this system is linked directly with the analysis of these contradictions.

The directly social and planned form of production which forms the simplest and most elementary economic relationship under socialism is itself internally complex and objectively reveals a particular subordination of its various "strata" and "levels." One of them relates to the state of real socialization, another to the position of workers which expresses this state, and yet another to the specific method of coupling the structure of social production with the structure of social needs.

The level of socialization, which forms the deep material foundation of the directly social form of production, is characterized, on the one hand, by the fusion of previously uncoordinated and isolated production processes into a single social production process which, during the stage of developed socialism, finds expression in the formation of a unified national economic complex. On the other hand, this level is linked with the preservation of relative localization of technical and technological processes and of differences in their scale and direction. The first aspect requires unified centralized management of the economy and the primacy of the national economic approach, while the second requires a certain independence in all production links.

The existing economic machinery does not yet ensure in all instances the implementation of the primacy of the national economic approach. One of the most substantial shortcomings here is that, when evaluating the activity of all economic links starting with the individual workplace, the links are still examined to a considerable extent in isolation, as if they were self-contained. However, under the conditions of high level of socialization of production, which is implemented on the basis of ownership by the whole people, each one of these links is only one element of an economic complex of a higher order, and ultimately of the national economic organism as a whole. This is why it is decisive to explain specifically in each individual instance what contribution has been made by each lower link to the results of each

higher economic link's activity (by the individual worker to the results of the team's work; by the team to the results of shop or enterprise operations; by the enterprise to the sector's efforts aimed at satisfying the relevant social needs; by the sector to the ultimate effect of the functioning of the unified national economic complex, whose purpose it is to ensure the fullest possible satisfaction of the entire current total of social needs given the existing resources). The primacy of the national economic approach presupposes, therefore, that each economic link's activity will be appraised from the standpoint of the higher level and that this appraisal will be made directly dependent on the attained level of satisfaction of a specific consumer's specific needs.

All the well-known variants for appraising each economic link's activity that are implemented regardless of the link's contribution to the satisfaction of specific social needs, stimulate so-called "resource tactics." According to these tactics, the economic leader is sometimes concerned not with how to intensify production and to produce, within the limitations of existing resources, output whose qualitative and quantitative specifications correspond precisely with really existing needs, but with how to "justify" the need for higher costs per unit of output and consequently, to obtain additional resources from the state. "Resource tactics" are one of the reasons why shortages of a number of resource products remain and sometimes even increase, despite the steady growth in the volume of their production.

"Resource tactics," which are incompatible with the economy's transfer to the path of intensive development, are in a number of instances necessitated by the existing practice of price formation whereby prices are determined by totaling expenditures. It is well-known that Marx, in contrast to Smith, contended that value is not composed of different elements but decomposes into them. Value is created as a single whole, and not by merely any but only by the socially necessary expenditure of labor. The totaling of expenditure when determining prices means that prices lose the role of a social normative, makes it possible to shift excessively high expenditure onto society, and does not encourage enterprises and sectors to seek the most effective technical and technological solutions.

The most important conditions for success in the large-scale economic experiment to improve the management machinery currently in progress in the country are: more resolute implementation of the line of enhancing the authority of economic contracts and the effectiveness of sanctions for their violations; a quest for new forms of consumer influence on the producer (including extradepartmental control); and bringing the appraisal of the activity of all links in the national economy strictly into line with the end national economic results.

The development of economic links' independence envisaged by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Additional Measures To Expand the Rights of Industrial Production Associations (Enterprises) in Planning and in Economic Activity and to Enhance Their Responsibility for the Results of Work" is of special significance for raising the level of the planned and directly social organization of production. The artificial limitation of this independence hinders creativity at local level and fetters

initiative and maneuverability. "...Why conceal the fact," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said, "that there are still instances where local initiative is essentially fettered under the guise of a struggle against localism? This is no good. The expansion of economic initiative and creativity at the level of economic regions, associations and enterprises is one of the most important and truly statewide tasks."

Political economy literature frequently links independent economic activity by individual links of the socialist economy with the preservation and utilization of goods-money relationships. There can be no doubt that such a link does exist, but the independence of economic links also has grounds that are independent of the above-mentioned relationships and lie in the contradictory nature of the socialization of production itself.

The substantial growth of socialization which forms the unified national economic complex does not remove--as has already been noted--the relative "singularity" and localization of individual processes or the differences in their scale or direction. Furthermore, as the technical and technological links between sectors, spheres, regions and production units expand and intensify, the dependence of national economic results on the state of affairs in each individual link not only does not diminish but, on the contrary, increases sharply.

The increase in the complexity of national economic ties means that the factors of economic development become increasingly diverse and mobile. This alone makes it simply impossible to take all their aspects into consideration directly at the unified center. Indeed, there is no need whatever for this: In order to ensure the national economy's planned development (the a priori coordination of social production and social consumption), it is sufficient for the top level of the hierarchical structure of planned management to determine only the basic, main and fundamental parameters.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism always linked planned organization with centralized management on a society-wide scale. "Socialism is unthinkable...without a planned state organization subordinating tens of millions of people to the strictest observance of a single norm in the matter of production and product distribution," Lenin stressed. "We Marxists have always said this, and people who have not understood even this...are not worth even two seconds of conversation" (op. cit., vol 36, p 300). At the same time, Marx, Engels and Lenin not only never claimed that planned centralized management removes the independence of production links, but actually directly insisted that this independence be preserved. Formulating the theoretical foundations of the organization of nationalized production, Lenin wrote: "...Centralism, in the truly democratic sense, presupposes the opportunity, created for the time in history, for the complete and unhindered development not only of local particularities but also of local ideas, local initiative, and a variety of ways, methods, and means of moving toward the common goal" (ibid., p 152; see also ibid., p 185).

A view that holds that Marx and Engels limited themselves to examining the future society at the national economic level and failed to raise the question of the role of individual economic links is represented in literature. In



actual fact, the fundamental methodological basis for the formulation of this question is to be found, for example, in Engels' work "On Authority," which draws the following fundamental conclusion: "Authority and independence are relative things, and the sphere of their application changes together with the various phases of social development... The social organization of the future will allow authority...within the boundaries which are inevitably prescribed by the conditions of production..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 18, pp 304-305).

The initial problem in improving the system of management of socialist production is precisely that of specifically finding the proportion of centralism and production links' independence at each stage of development as well as the forms of combining ones that are objectively "prescribed" by the specific features of the stage in question.

What are, in our view, simplistic ideas about the independence of economic links, according to which this independence is virtually reduced to the question of the number of indicators centrally set for the enterprise (association) and about the so-called "self-financing," are sometimes encountered. These aspects are, of course, enormously significant, but independence in economic activity is a much more multifaceted phenomenon. It also presupposes, in particular, the chance to choose between options for implementing the general directions of development laid down by the center; not only the responsibility of lower links and organs to superior links, but also the responsibility of the former to the latter; and the participation of all economic links and labor collectives in the elaboration of plan targets and the determination of the main parameters of development. In this connection, it is obvious that the drafting of national economic plans cannot be a process that proceeds in one direction (from the top downwards) but must, without fail, include the reverse movement as well.

Trends toward forming stable structural units on the one hand, and toward constantly reorganizing the existing structures on the other, take place within the framework of the unified economy. The second trend intensifies as the dynamism of production increases. It is, furthermore, clear that, the less mobile the economy's structural correlations are, the easier it is to ensure its balance in a planned fashion.

Nevertheless, under the conditions of transition to a predominantly intensive type of expanded reproduction, the significance of structural changes as a factor in raising production efficiency and satisfying the various mobile needs increases sharply. However, in the new situation, the existing forms and methods of plan leadership of the economy still do not provide the due combination of stability and mobility in structural correlations. One of the effective ways of resolving this contradiction, discovered by the practice of economic management, is to elaborate and implement long-term comprehensive targeted programs. The quest in this direction continues.

The issue of the national economy's basic structure-forming elements is of fundamental significance when determining ways to improve the economic machinery. It is no accident that it has recently become the subject of acute debate. The main point is that the unified national economic complex is based



upon its constituent subcomplexes, whose accelerated formation today is an obvious reality. One of the main objective features of the present stage of the socialization of production is that the role of the main structure-forming elements is increasingly passing from single-plant enterprises and sectors to interfarm (production) associations and intersector and territorial production complexes. It is, of course, a question not of the disappearance of the sector, but of the fact that a trend is developing for the sector to lose its role as the basic structural link in the economy. Accordingly there is an increasing need to find ways to provide the optimum combination of the sectorial principle, on which the planning and management of the national economy are presently based, with the leadership of the subcomplexes that are being formed within the framework of the unified national economic complex.

It is well-known that, by transforming the satisfaction of individual needs from the private affair of each individual person into the common cause of producers' associations, the directly social form of production guarantees a certain level of personal consumption for working people. On the one hand, this fact is the greatest social gain of socialism. On the other hand, it creates, given the insufficient conscientiousness of some members of society, an opportunity for the development of parasitical feelings, complacency and elements of stagnation. This is an objective contradiction. One of the most important problems of planned economic management is, therefore, to improve the methods of enhancing labor activeness specific to socialism, not by renouncing, but by consolidating the above-mentioned guarantee.

The formulation of the question of inherent contradictions in the planned method of coupling production with consumption presupposes, above all else, the explanation of the fact that the transition from one state of the economic system to another (from one reproduction cycle to another) under socialism is mediated by the national economic plan. The latter links the distribution of production resources a priori with the system of social needs. Contradictions during the process of this transition emerge, both within the sphere of reflecting the existing objective conditions and development needs in the plan, and within the sphere of the movement from the plans' directives to the actual implementation of production and labor. The existence of these contradictions predetermines the need to verify the extent to which the products produced match the existing social needs and to compare the actual and the socially necessary expenditure of labor (and improve the method of verification and comparison) and to enhance the responsibility of superior organs and links to lower ones for the decisions that are made.

The political economic literature of recent years correctly notes that the vast size of our modern national economy, the effect of the economy's large scale, the fact that the number of economic links is increasing in geometrical progression, and so on are a real factor in the difficulties arising in planned management.

At the same time, it is exceptionally important to bear in mind that the increase in the scale of the socialist economy creates obstacles to planned development only when theory and practice ignore the inherent contradictions in the directly social form of production, and only when those elements of the existing economic machinery that are not effective forms of the movement and

solution of these contradictions are retained. The growth in the scope of production and in the level of its actual socialization in reality opens up new potential for the planned improvement of socialism's entire economic system.

It has already been noted that the sum total of the contradictions in production relations under developed socialism is by no means limited only to contradictions in the directly social form of production. The analysis of them must above all be supplemented by an analysis of contradictions in the fundamental production relationship and the fundamental economic law. The question of the fundamental contradiction of the new mode of production must also be fully clarified.

Contradictions also exist in the distribution relations specific to the first phase of communism. The improvement of the machinery of material incentives is called upon to provide forms for the movement and solution of these contradictions which are adequate for the attained level of development.

The formation of the communist system of production relations as an integral system does not preclude the existence of genetically noninherent and heterogeneous elements during the first phase of its historic evolution. In this connection, the revelation and solution of the contradictions introduced into our economy by goods-money relations comprise an important component in the process of enhancing the efficiency of their utilization in communist construction.

The above-mentioned "subsystems" of economic contradictions, like the existing contradictions between various structural groups of production relations at the initial stage of developed socialism, have their own specific features. Their comprehensive study and consideration are exceptionally important for ensuring the comprehensive nature of the process of restructuring the machinery of the national economy's plan leadership on a truly scientific basis.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15

## COLLECTIVE THOUGHT, CLOSE-KNIT ACTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) pp 54-64

[Article by V. Markov]

[Text] The vitality, practical effectiveness and historical justice of Leninism have been proved by the decades of victorious struggle for socialism and communism, waged by the working class and the people's masses under the leadership of the Leninist party. The fruitfulness of CPSU policy is ensured not only by the scientific veracity of its theoretical foundation and profound consistency between communist ideology and the basic interests of the working people. The fact that in its theoretical concepts and in the scientific conclusions of Marxism-Leninism the party formulates political decisions which are understood by the masses and which guide them toward the implementation of vital daily tasks is of most important significance, for it is able to combine ideas and decisions with the experience of the working people and to establish and organize the united, joint work of millions and dozens of millions of people, steadily enhancing their labor and sociopolitical activeness.

This is familiar to anyone who tries to understand the real course of the revolutionary transforming practices of the Soviet people and the historical role of the communist party. However, even the most obvious truths of social knowledge are such only thanks to the fact that they are always enriched by new historical experience and concretized in accordance with new historical conditions. The dialectical connection between CPSU theory and policy and the practice of building socialism and communism are no exception in this respect. Changing dynamic social life always raises for the party and its committees and organizations and always in a somewhat different manner the question of the characteristic forms of combining theory with practice, ideology with the living experience of the masses and political decisions with daily organizational work specific to a given historical period.

Unquestionably, the current period--the period of the implementation of the resolutions of the 26th Party Congress--shares this feature. "...The November 1982 and June and December 1983 CPSU Central Committee plenums," noted Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, "have become important landmarks in the life of the party and the people. The plenum's decisions mark the further creative development and concretizing of the political line of the 26th CPSU Congress."

The content of this period is highly instructive. The objectives of CPSU policy and the principles governing its activities have remained unchanged. The party's concentration on the most topical economic, social and ideological-political problems, the enhancement of the level of ideological and organizational work among the masses and, in this connection, the intensified harnessing of the energy and initiative of the working people yielded tangible national economic and moral-political results. With full justification the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum noted that substantial positive changes have taken place in economic and social life. Within a relatively short time the situation has been corrected in a number of sectors; cadre initiative and responsibility and confidence in their forces have been strengthened and the creative activeness of the masses has been enhanced. The charted course which, as we know, met with the full approval and support of the party members and all working people, was further developed at the February and April 1984 CPSU Central Committee plenums.

It would be impossible within a single article to make a full study of the characteristics of this period, the end of which coincides with the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress. The purpose of this article is more limited: to describe some characteristics in party decision-making, consistent with the requirements of the present, and the ways of combining the ideas they contain with the experience, opinions, feelings and desires of the masses and the conditions for the conversion of such ideas to practical actions. The importance of the slogan formulated by Comrade K. U. Chernenko "from accurate thoughts and comprehensive experience to daring action!" is of major significance not only in economics but in organizational and ideological education work on all party levels.

#### Practical Power of Political Decisions

People and party are as one. How accurate and profound is this truth, tested by time and confirmed by historical practice! Even in a strictly intraparty process, such as the accountability and elections campaign, which took place between the end of 1983 and the beginning of 1984, clearly reflected many characteristic features of life in Soviet society--a society of developed socialism. One of the most outstanding among them is the highly stressed collective thinking of party members and the increasingly interested attitude of the Soviet people toward our joint successes and still-existing shortcomings.

"The accountability and election campaign," we read in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Main Results of Party Accountability Reports and Elections and the Tasks of Party Organizations," "took place in accordance with the political stipulations of the CPSU Central Committee. It proved the further increase of the party's leading role, the high level of conscientiousness and activeness of the party members, the inflexible unity between party and people, their solidarity with the CPSU Central Committee and their resolve to struggle tirelessly for the implementation of the Leninist domestic and foreign policy course. It became a good school for training the party members and enhancing their vanguard role in society."



To a large extent these results were achieved thanks to the fact that in the very course of the accountability and election conferences and the businesslike and constructive discussion of urgent problems of advancing developed socialism took into consideration the specific level required, the necessities of the moment and the views and demands of the masses, and summed up acquired experience. The resolutions adopted at party meetings and conferences were, therefore, as a rule a concentration of practical experience and collective thinking. The creative search for ways to ensure the most efficient implementation of imminent economic-political and sociocultural tasks, which preceded and paralleled their adoption, served as a kind of "ferment" in further enhancing the social activeness of the masses.

The advancement of developed socialism does not occur by itself, spontaneously. By virtue of its very existence this is a conscious, a systematic, a creative process. It represents an increasing knowledge of the new society in which we live, the active development of anything advanced and progressive, the persistent elimination of phenomena alien to socialism and, naturally, a consistent struggle for the observance of socialist principles in all realms of social life. The comprehensive solution of such problems ensures the "materializing" of communist ideas after they have been mastered by the masses and implemented.

The ideas unanimously shared by our society "function" at full capacity when they have become sufficiently concretized in terms of the characteristics of the various parts of the country, the areas of social practice and the labor collectives, and the specific interests of social, sociodemographic or professional groups within society. In order to rally and mobilize the masses for the implementation of the party's ideas and stipulations a differentiated approach to mass political work must be adopted among the various population categories, along with a steady enrichment of its methods, ways and means. This is one of the prerequisites for the manifestation of the combat capability of the party organizations and their ability to head the masses and to ensure the communists' vanguard role.

The accountability and election campaign provided many examples of party organizations' proper understanding and implementation of the strategic task of comprehensively advancing developed socialism. As we know, the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum focused attention on the politically grave problem of comprehensively enhancing the labor and political activeness of the masses, increasing their consciousness and organization and strengthening production, planning and state discipline at all levels of social life. The ways to implement the party's stipulations through ideological means were thoroughly elaborated at the June 1983 Central Committee Plenum.

These stipulations became pivotal in preparations for and conducting of the accountability and election campaign in the Moscow City Party Organization, one of the largest CPSU detachments. The struggle for strengthening discipline and order developed into the mass movement of "honor and glory according to labor!" which was joined by working people in other cities and parts of the country. The decisive trend of socioeconomic development at this stage--upgrading production efficiency, intensifying the interconnection between social and economic progress and improving work quality in all

sectors--are the base of other mass initiatives ably supported by the party organizations.

Thus, for example, the 25th anniversary of the movement of shock workers and communist labor collectives, which coincided with the beginning of the accountability and election campaign, inspired the frontranking production collectives in the capital to initiate 25 shock work weeks. Its mass dissemination and the comprehensive development of the outstanding traditions of the initiators of the movement for a communist attitude toward labor drew the attention of the party groups and primary organizations to achieving the highest possible labor productivity and to improving the organization of labor.

Naturally, problems of upgrading organizational and technical production standards, accelerating scientific and technical progress, struggling for the conservation of all types of resources, the efficient utilization of productive capital and capital investments, timely installation of new production capacities and projects and improving production quality became the focal point of accountability and election party conferences and meetings, their resolutions and the organizational and ideological and political work of the party members in the capital. Their party organizations, including those in transportation, communal and consumer services, health care, education and culture, gave them priority in finding the specific means for their implementation.

This purposefulness in the decisions made by the party organizations and their daily organizational and ideological education work yielded noticeable results. Moscow's economy is developing on a stable and dynamic basis. The plans for 1983 and for the first 3 years of the five-year plan were fulfilled ahead of schedule for the basic indicators. The increased volumes of output were achieved as a result of higher labor productivity. The mass movement of Moscow's working people for above-plan increases in labor productivity and for lowering production costs and more efficient utilization of productive capital was given a high rating at the December 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and became part of the nationwide struggle for the fulfillment and overfulfillment of the plans for 1984 and the first 4 years of the 11th Five-Year Plan. Such is the great strength of party resolutions which properly combine the objective of improving developed socialism with daily labor tasks!

Reliance on reality and on the level of consciousness and organization reached by the working people is a major aspect in party decision-making. Here is a small example described in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA by P. Chernenkov, brigade leader at the Kommunal'nik Machine Building Plant and member of the shop's party bureau. The decision taken by the shop party organization to set up brigades remained unfulfilled because the workers were psychologically unprepared for this; the new forms of labor organization and incentive had not been backed by proper organizational and educational work. Proper lessons were drawn from the failure. The patient and persistent activities of the party organization and concern for unifying the new collectives, enhancing labor standards and developing collectivistic principles yielded good results: viable brigades were organized. The author of this note indicated quite correctly the importance of ensuring consistency in the work of party members, which

includes passing decrees: "The topic to be discussed at the meeting has been indicated by the previous meeting; a decision is supported by subsequent decisions, at which point an efficient work line develops for the party organization in its efforts to increase the party's influence in resolving economic problems." This is an inaccurate conclusion, for proper decisions "work out" whenever they express a single line and are a link within the same chain of systematic daily activities.

In the course of the accountability and election campaign the party membership paid great attention to the system of drafting collective resolutions. The interest of developing intraparty democracy requires the elimination of formalism, excessive organization and anything which may paralyze the initiative of rank-and-file members. The profoundly democratic nature inherent in the Leninist party must be invariably manifested in the party organizations' decision-making process. "Essentially," Muscovite D. Lipnyak, a CPSU member since 1920, wrote in PRAVDA, "this must be the result of collective thinking, mandatory not only for the secretary or the members of the party bureau or committee but for every party member.... Such a responsible and interested attitude toward an adopted decision may appear only if it is truly the result of the creative work of the entire collective of party members rather than the secretary alone or several bureau members who were instructed to draft a resolution."

Noteworthy in this connection is the support given to the experience of the party members in Yelets, as described in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. Two weeks before the rayon party conference, the raykom distributed the accountability report among the primary party organizations, along with a survey in which the conference delegates were asked to express their views on the workstyle and methods of the raykom and the activities of local soviets and rayon trade union and Komsomol organizations, enterprises and establishments. The effect of this new feature exceeded all expectations: a large number of specific remarks and suggestions were received and the report became to an even greater extent the embodiment of the collective thinking of the rayon's party members, while the work of the conference was truly businesslike, lively, critical and purposeful.

Naturally, a variety of methods may be used to energize the party masses (including forms of participation in decision-making). Essentially, they must contribute to enhancing the activeness of the party members. More than 11.5 million party members spoke out during the accountability and elections conferences in the country's party organizations; 3 million remarks and suggestions were made covering a broad range of problems of party work, development of the economy and culture, improvements in the working and living conditions of the Soviet people and relative to the communist upbringing of the working people.

#### On Criticism

The past accountability and election campaign, and, in general, intraparty and overall social life have been distinguished of late by a tangible increase in the interest shown by the people in improving matters in all areas of communist construction. The aspiration to study more profoundly the workings



of all factors which influence production development, resolution of social problems, strengthening order and maintaining and further improving a healthy ideological and moral atmosphere in state and public life in all parts of the country, intensified. The vivifying fresh wind of party criticism and self-criticism multiplies the energy of the party members and enhances the tone of the work of party organizations and the toiling masses they head.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Main Results of the Accountability and Election Meetings in the Party and the Tasks of Party Organizations" points out that "while noting the tangible results achieved after the 26th CPSU Congress in the implementation of the party's social policy and enhancing the living standards of the people, the party members thoroughly analyzed the practical activities of party, soviet, trade union and economic organizations and labor collectives for the implementation of plans and measures related to satisfying the growing material and spiritual demands of the working people and for criticizing the shortcomings and omissions in this work." The figures we cited above confirm the high-level activeness of the party members in the course of the accountability and election meetings and prove the development of intraparty democracy and the enhanced level of criticism and self-criticism.

Criticism is something natural to socialism. It is a method inherent precisely in the new system for molding and expressing public opinion and a form of manifestation of direct democracy in the activities of the broad toiling masses. Its development is of major importance. Furthermore, criticism and self-criticism are one of the main methods in the development of the social creativity of the people's masses, which are the decisive force of history, including also under the conditions of the advancement of developed socialism and its gradual progress toward a communist future.

Criticism and self-criticism play a great constructive role. However, they should not be understood and interpreted one-sidedly, reducing them merely to indicating negative phenomena in life, or limiting them to the formulation of negative assessments. The concept that criticism is a way to formulate negative judgments substantially narrows its field of action and role and makes groundless the question of the need for constructive criticism. With this kind of approach critical remarks as well are sometimes assessed as manifestations of negativism. Frequently even public opinion is improperly turned from the consideration of actual problems to the personality of the critics. Furthermore, with such a one-sided understanding of criticism, people with low political standards are tempted to make the criticism "more substantial" by intensifying shortcomings and increasing negative assessments. Other consequences of a psychological and sociopsychological nature are also harmful to the development of criticism. The exaggerating of negative phenomena and shortcomings (which, let us be honest, is occasionally the case in the press) creates in some people a mistaken concept of the situation in society and develops in them feelings of insecurity and passiveness. Meanwhile, the facts themselves of such "concentrated" criticism sometimes create in some people a cautious attitude toward criticism in general as well as various prejudices. In newspaper practice, for example, this leads to fussy efforts to balance "negatives" (the term used by some journalists to



describe critical materials) with materials free of problems or simply by publishing sugary "positives."

"Criticism, when understood accurately, in a Leninist and bolshevik way, based on an objective analysis of the real situation, means adopting a practical, a constructive approach to the problems and a creative search for possibilities and ways of improving the work. The party sets a model of such criticism in its documents by demanding of its cadres--party, soviet and economic managers--a profound analysis and to set the proper tone in their work. Exposure of negative phenomena and specific culprits is only part of criticism and self-criticism (a necessary part, naturally), the main objective of which is to establish the ways and means for surmounting shortcomings, correcting the situation and accelerating progress.

Incidentally, such precisely is the overall nature of mass criticism or, as we say, criticism "from below." It is inseparable from the development of the labor and political initiative of the masses, which intensifies its positive and creative significance even further. Inherent in the working people is a morally healthy assessment of phenomena in our life. Negativism is alien to them. The working people have adopted from the Leninist party such an attitude toward criticism and an aspiration for a comprehensive, objective and just assessment of reality, having realized in practice the fruitfulness of the party's policy, decisions, methods of analysis and formulation of assessments relative to vital problems. It is with such a content and trend in mass criticism from below in mind that Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized at the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum that "party members have the duty of steadily checking their course, decisions and actions above all with the thoughts of the working class and its tremendous sociopolitical and class sensitivity. Vladimir Il'ich Lenin always highly rated the directness, substantiation and clarity of views of the working person. He listened closely to his opinions and evaluations of events and people. He sought and found in them answers to even the most crucial problems."

The study of shortcomings, the creation of an atmosphere of irreconcilability toward negative phenomena in the economy, society, labor and daily life are inseparable aspects of the interest shown by party members and all working people in the steady progress of our society and its successes. We have no reasons to fear an open discussion of shortcomings or to avoid criticism of their reasons or culprits. On the contrary, as was noted at the session of the CPSU Central Committee commission in charge of drafting the new CPSU program, "we must avoid idealizing and anticipation." Only poor and idle workers are interested in "glossing over" the real situation and embellishing facts, people who neither can nor are willing to carry out their assignments in a conscientious and energetic manner and with maximal usefulness to society. The harm of distorting the real situation in one sector or another becomes clearer if we recall that account padding is one of its extreme cases. It is hardly necessary to explain that misrepresenting economic data directly harms the production process. It disorganizes management and planning and has a corrupting influence on morality and on shaping labor relations within collectives. However, even without resorting to such extremes, any attempt at concealing shortcomings or painful phenomena of spinelessness behind illusory success is inadmissible.

The cleansing shower of criticism, although causing temporary unpleasantness to the culprits or to those who tolerate them while standing aside, can be very useful to the common project as well as to these people. "...Publicity," Lenin pointed out, "is a sword which heals the wounds it causes" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 53). Our party is guided precisely by this Leninist instruction when it provides scope for the development of principle-minded and efficient criticism and self-criticism. Criticism is the enemy of stagnation, complacency, placidity and slackness. It is with its help that the masses assume unremitting control over lagging sectors in our construction and increase their own activeness. As was emphasized at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the implementation of the difficult and extensive tasks of improving developed socialism "is impossible without the extensive development of the initiative and creativity of the masses and without their most energetic involvement in resolving crucial problems of social life."

The main role of criticism is to be mobilizing and constructive. Any serious discussion of ways to develop production and other areas of social life must be imbued with the desire to improve the work and to achieve new successes. In other words, it must be critical. Only this makes possible the fruitful search of means for the practical solution of urgent problems with the participation of the broad masses and, therefore, the process of surmounting anything which hinders what is new and progressive and its assertion and growth. Examples of creative work by the party organizations in the course of the accountability and elections campaign are precisely examples of productive work by entire collectives, including large organizations, engaged in a mass search for possibilities of accelerating our progress. Long-term decisions and valuable results of collective experience are acquired precisely as a result of comprehensive studies and principle-minded and businesslike discussion of common problems.

The more extensively criticism and self-criticism develop, precisely in the course of this discussion, the more the ideas of party decisions blend with the thoughts and feelings of the masses and the greater becomes the practical strength and effectiveness of such decisions. The party's ideas and stipulations become a great material constructive force the more firmly and extensively the masses adopt them as a basis for action. The active support of party policies and decisions by the masses and the growth of their labor and political activeness in the struggle for the further blossoming of the homeland are the favorable social foundations for steady progress toward the triumph of our lofty ideals. This is also a means of organizing the type of overall state and public accountability and control which Lenin considered a mandatory prerequisite for the proper functioning of the first phase of the communist system. "...Accountability and control," he wrote, "must be provided initially by the worker organizations and subsequently by literally the entire population" (op. cit., vol 36, p 75).

Criticism is the creative--intellectual and emotional--principle of such accountability and control aimed at implementing the interests, aspirations and will of the masses rallied around the communist party. It is a mechanism

for embodying theory into practice and words into actions in all realms of social life, inherent in our Soviet society.

#### Unity of Words and Actions Is a Feature of the Leninist Workstyle

One of the reasons thanks to which the Leninist party won the complete trust of the masses is that throughout its entire heroic history its words have never differed from its actions. This is the only line which should be inherent in any party organization. A decision is authoritative only when it is carried out, when words are backed by actions and real results are achieved. Even the best planned collective decision loses its value unless followed by persistent, well-organized and effective work.

Lenin formulated this question directly and sharply. In his letter to the RKP organizations on preparations for the party congress (February 1920) he particularly singled out the requirement of firm implementation of decisions: "In our understanding of the tasks of the present and of the party congress, practical experience must be taken into consideration, in order to reject what is harmful and to bring together everything valuable in order accurately to define a number of immediate practical measures and implement them at all cost, stopping at no sacrifice" (op. cit., vol 40, p 144).

The precise determination of a number of most immediate practical problems and earmarking the type of measures and means of resolving them which would ensure "their implementation at all cost" are the most important requirements relative to party decisions. The strict and full implementation gives decisions a mandatory practical importance and enhances their authority (and, therefore, the authority of the party itself) among the toiling masses, among the people.

Lenin's instruction of giving priority to practicality and efficiency in organizational work (see op. cit., vol 36, p 159) becomes extraordinarily important and relevant under contemporary conditions although, naturally, it assumes forms different from those of 1918 and the first years of the Soviet system. The essence, however, remains the same: unity between words and actions and mandatory implementation of plans and decisions.

"The main thing now," noted Comrade K. U. Chernenko, "is to consolidate and multiply the positive changes taking place in all areas of social life, guided by the resolutions of the 26th Party Congress and CPSU Central Committee Plenum. It is particularly important now, comrades, to emphasize specific actions and to achieve real and substantial results. It is precisely on this basis that the party will assess the maturity of leading cadres, the work of labor collectives and the achievements of republics, oblasts and all economic sectors in our country."

Today the decisive criterion in assessing the activities of party organizations and committees is the emphasis on efficiency, practicality and effectiveness of organizational work. Unity between words and actions and between decisions and their execution is being increasingly accepted as the political and moral essence of the Leninist style and as a mandatory prerequisite for achieving new successes, above all in the course of



comprehensively perfecting developed socialism. It is frequently said that decisions, even the most accurate and the best, would not move even a rock. As history proves, they are effective only when they have been taken to the proper sites, to the control organizations and the performers as a result of properly set and coordinated organizational and ideological-political work.

In its decree "On the Work of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee on Improving the Style and Method of Activities of Party Organizations in the Light of the Resolutions of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum" the CPSU Central Committee emphasized that "the entire workstyle of the party organizations and the leading bodies must reliably guarantee the strict observance of the Leninist norms of party life, the further development of intraparty democracy, criticism and self-criticism, the initiative and responsibility of party members and their active participation in decision-making and implementation. Principles of collectivity in the work must be comprehensively strengthened and implemented not formally but in their essence and consistently to the end."

That is precisely why in the course of the accountability and election campaign in the party organizations throughout the country that such serious attention was paid to the comprehensive assertion of the Leninist style of management and to improving the work methods of party committees. Enthusiasm for office paperwork, which turns into an alienation from life and adoption of a passive attitude, was criticized sharply. Thus, in their self-critical assessment of shortcomings in economic management, the delegates to the Alma-Ata Oblast Party Conference cited the following facts: 20 percent of the oblast's enterprises failed to fulfill their plans; more than one-quarter of all enterprises failed to fulfill their procurement plans and more than one-third of the construction organizations did not meet their targets for volume of work, increasing labor productivity and reducing production costs. Among the main reasons for such major shortcomings the delegates listed the low level of party guidance of the economy and the inclination for paperwork. It turned out that over a 3-year period the Alma-Ata party raykoms passed a total of 5,300 decrees (totaling 22,000 pages); gorkoms passed 964 decrees (7,200 pages), and the obkom issued 724 decrees totaling 2,350 pages. Willy-nilly, under such circumstances the work turns itself into reading and working with documents.

Some party workers are familiar with the local situation on the basis of reports and references. The question legitimately arises of whether such a mass of papers is useful to the cause or instead alienates party committees from living reality.

The "efficiency" of such a paper style was criticized at the Krasnodar Kray Party Conference as well. Delegates to the conference reported that at Irbeyskiy Raykom live organizational work has been replaced by paper shuffling and a large number of office-based steps. As a result, although over the past 2 years the raykom bureau considered on 15 separate occasions the development of animal husbandry, the situation in the rayon's livestock farm remained unsatisfactory. Faith in the omnipotence of promulgated decisions and directives and inability to convert from words to actions and to organize the practical implementation of decisions were qualified by Lenin as communist



conceit and considered one of the major evils to be surmounted, outlived and eliminated.

In recent years the party has decisively intensified its struggle against manifestations of a formalistic-bureaucratic approach to the work and the aspiration of passive and initiative-lacking workers to avoid urgent contemporary problems by hiding behind heaps of paper. Unfortunately, such manifestations and ways of work, which can only be described as office-bureaucratic, remain frequent, for which reason Lenin's characterization of such phenomena remains relevant: "We are being dragged down into the foul bureaucratic swamp of writing papers, speaking about and writing decrees, in the course of which live work is drowned in this sea of paper" (op. cit., vol 44, p 364). We still come across people who feel themselves at home precisely in a "bureaucratic swamp," unable (and frequently unwilling) to engage in live organizational work.

Naturally, the definitive elimination of bureaucratism will not take place tomorrow. It calls for enhancing the political standards of the masses and the full implementation of Lenin's requirement that "literally all working people actively participate in universal accountability and control and in the administration of social affairs. However, the arsenal of developed socialism also includes many other means of struggle against formalism and red tape and for the strict effectiveness of resolutions and unity between words and actions, in addition to the already noted work with cadres. It is people who implement the resolutions passed by the party organizations with the help of the party's collective mind. A great deal depends precisely on the organizers and managers, and on their practical, political and moral qualities.

In this respect the accountability and election campaign in the party organizations was a test of the way party, soviet and economic cadres were implementing the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums. The results of this investigation were the basis on which cadres were rated and which in many cases led to strict organizational conclusions. Thus, in the course of the Krasnodar Kray Party Conference, ways of enhancing the responsibility of managers and the party aktiv were exigently discussed; violations of the principles and requirements governing the choice of cadres, which had taken place recently, were sharply criticized. In correcting such violations, the kray's party organization is taking steps to strengthen the Leninist norms of party life, state discipline and socialist legality. People enjoying the trust of the party members and all working people are being appointed to positions of leading organizational work: in Krasnodar alone, more than 400 specialists were promoted to leading positions in accordance with the views held by party organizations and labor collectives.

The CPSU Central Committee decree notes that in the course of the accountability and election campaign "the communists unanimously approved the steps taken by the party to strengthen the various sectors of party, state, economic and public work with politically mature, skilled and energetic managers with high moral qualities." Today the moral rating of cadres becomes particularly important. Naturally, in no case should it be reduced to personal evaluations, for the decisive features in determining the moral

qualities of an individual are his desire and ability to be loyal to the cause and to party ideology and politics and to defend the state, the national interests (including, naturally, the comprehensive assertion of socialist comradeship in relations among people).

In Lenin's view "the struggle for strengthening and completing communism" is a criterion of our morality (see op. cit., vol 41, p 313). Competence, knowledge of the work, ability to ensure the observance of Leninist norms of party life and management principles and ability to work with people are of major moral importance to managers and organizers. Simpler moral requirements as well are equally important: let us recall, for example, the assessments of personal qualities in which Lenin was interested in considering candidates for high economic positions: "a) conscientiousness; b) political stance; c) knowledge of the work; d) administrative ability..." (op. cit., vol 53, p 97). Noteworthy is the fact that Lenin gave priority to conscientiousness.

Honesty toward the party and the people and ability systematically to fulfill one's obligations and party and civic duty and sacredly to observe Soviet laws and Leninist norms of party, state and social life are the mandatory prerequisites for successful activities by cadres and all managers. Such qualities are being increasingly demanded of all party members. In joining the CPSU--the party of like-minded people--every one of them assumes the obligation of being a political fighter, an active Leninist and organizer of the masses, and to march in the vanguard of the builders of communism.

The party's clear political formulation of the forthcoming and long-term social development tasks is not only the pivot for their practical solution but the ideological base for organizational and political organization work among the masses and their mobilization, cohesion and purposeful activities.

The political emphasis of party resolutions gives them ideological-moral power and a great agitation force. Concreteness, efficiency, practicality and political relevance do not "compete" against looking at more distant prospects and ideals but, conversely, make them reciprocally supportive. The decisions of CPSU congresses and Central Committee plenums are examples of organically combining political trends with specific practical actions. It is entirely understandable why the decisions made by the Central Committee over the past 1.5 to 2 years have so profoundly excited the toiling masses and provided an impetus for such clearly positive shifts in the economy and all social life. The masses sensitively detect the new aspects in the political assessment of social phenomena and party stipulations and see in the new political formulas within them the extension and development of Leninist and bolshevik traditions. That is why, Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized, "collectively formulated concepts on key trends of social development and all recent achievements represent a substantial political capital which we shall preserve and multiply."

The assertion and mastery of the Leninist workstyle is the most important requirement not only of managing cadres but of party committees and organizations as a whole. The active fulfillment of their vanguard role by the party members and the level of combat capability of the party organizations decisively determine the implementation of the main prerequisite

of the Leninist style: indivisible unity between words and actions and systematic implementation of the party's policy and resolutions. The accurately planned and well-organized work of the party organizations is a guarantee for the successful mobilization of the working people in the struggle for achieving the objectives formulated by the CPSU and its Leninist Central Committee. It is precisely thus that the behest of the great Lenin, which is of decisive importance to us, can be honored: "We must go forth. We must rise higher with energy and unity of will" (op. cit., vol 40, p 254).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/15

## STRENGTHENING THE LEGAL BASE OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) pp 65-76

[Article by A. Sukharev, RSFSR minister of justice]

[Text] The further strengthening of the legal foundations of government and social life is considered by our party one of the key directions in the advancement of socialist democracy, socioeconomic development and the shaping of the new man. In performing the role of main regulator of social processes, the law has become a universal value, a constructive force which actively contributes to the assertion of the socialist principles and to securing the increased power of the state and the well-being of the Soviet people.

By its very nature developed socialism is a highly organized and disciplined society in which everyone is personally responsible for the common cause. It can successfully function only on a planned and streamlined legal basis. The advancement of our political system, the development of the scientific and technical revolution and the implementation of economic, social and cultural programs depend to a tremendous extent on the conscientiousness and civic maturity of the members of society and the systematic implementation of the principle "From Each According to His Capabilities and to Each According to His Work."

It is natural for problems of governmental and legal construction to have been elevated to a qualitatively new level in the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the USSR Constitution. The constitution, which was adopted on the eve of the 60th anniversary of the October Revolution, gave a powerful impetus to the advancement of Soviet legislation and to making it consistent with contemporary social requirements. Fruitful legal activities are taking place in the country on the basis of the fundamental law. Laws are being promulgated and aimed at the further development of nationwide statehood and more efficient regulation of activities of representative authorities and people's control, justice and prosecutor's supervision. They include the USSR Supreme Soviet regulations and the laws on the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR People's Control, USSR Supreme Court, USSR Prosecutor's Office and others.

A number of basic legal acts regulating the economic area have been issued in recent years. Let us note above all legislative norms which call for improving planning and capital construction, stimulating scientific and



technical progress and the growth of labor productivity and ensuring the rational utilization of material resources.

The concern of the CPSU and the Soviet state for enhancing the well-being of the working people, improving social insurance and medical services to the population, increasing state aid to families with children and raising wages and pensions of many categories of working people was legally codified. The Foundations of Housing Legislation of the USSR and Union Republics and republic housing codes were enacted, aimed at implementing the constitutional guarantee of the right of Soviet citizens to housing. Party and state resolutions on increasing environmental protection of the air, the water and the animal and vegetal world are imbued with concern for the good of present and future generations.

The drafting of a USSR Legal Code--a multiple-volume compilation of existing laws and basic decisions of the Soviet government--is a most important trend in such work. This publication, which will be completed in 1985, will unquestionably contribute to maintaining stable law and order and will make legal norms more accessible to the Soviet citizens.

Understandably, however perfect such legislation may be, it is only the foundation rather than the entire building of law and order, the structure and solidity of which, as we know, are based on a number of components, above all on the effectiveness of legal norms, the attitude toward the law and the legal standards of society.

Socialist law and order is a legally based system of social relations established in the interests of the broad masses and consistent with the profound and vitally important expectations and hopes of the working people. As we consider it in its historical development, we must note the clear trend toward its consolidation. Its qualitative feature is manifested in the increasingly greater consistency between the orders of the state, as expressed in the laws, and their factual observance and the daily actions and behavior of the citizens.

The main criterion of the strength of a legal order is conscious discipline--state, public, planning and labor. That is why the advancement of socialist democracy, the enrichment of the legal status of the individual and the broadening of his rights and freedoms are inconceivable without formulating stricter requirements regarding the observance of constitutional obligations and the civic stance of the people.

In guaranteeing broad rights and freedoms to all members of society, the constitution demands that everyone preserve and strengthen socialist property, preserve the natural resources of one's native area and observe labor discipline and the rules of socialist community life. The essence of our system, the most important principle of socialist democracy and the vital strength of the Soviet state are manifested in the organic unity between citizens' rights and obligations and reciprocal responsibility assumed by society and the individual.

Our laws and entire legal mechanism are called upon effectively to contribute to the development of production forces and to the even stronger assertion of the socialist way of life, and to counter all efforts at disturbing the legal order established in the country, encroachments on the people's property and various types of abuses and manifestations of parasitism.

"The party and the state," points out Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, "have intensified their struggle against shameful phenomena such as wasting state funds, whitewashing and abuse of official position, and theft and bribery. This is no temporary campaign but a line which will be pursued steadily and strictly. Here no leniency will be shown in anything or toward anyone. No one should have any illusions on this score."

CPSU activities on strengthening discipline and legality are consistent with the interests of society and based on V. I. Lenin's ideological and theoretical legacy, behest and lofty personal example. Lenin was tirelessly concerned with the strict observance of Soviet laws by all citizens, officials and organizations. Lying on Vladimir Il'ich's desk in his office, side by side with the party program, was the pamphlet "Obey the Laws of the Soviet Republic!" As a model of respect for the law himself, Lenin was a militant promoter of revolutionary discipline in all areas of social life. His letters and reports and a great deal of testimony by his fellow workers indicate the uncompromising way in which he struggled against deviations from established norms, regardless of who was involved, his merits and his rank.

CPSU theoretical and practical activities in state legal construction is a vivid example of the implementation of the leader's behests. Along with improving legislation the law enforcement bodies are improving their work; a set of socioeconomic and ideological measures is being implemented to prevent delinquencies and to enhance the role of legal levers in the economic area.

The resolutions of CPSU Central Committee plenums passed between 1982 and 1984 have been a noteworthy landmark in the further strengthening of law and order in our society. They have armed the party and the public with a militant realistic program for strengthening labor and state discipline and uprooting slackness, parasitism, loafing and bureaucratism.

The Soviet people welcomed with approval the steps for material, moral and disciplinary action taken against parasites and money-grubbers and all sorts of lovers of easy profits and those who confuse their pocket with that of the state. Taking the demands of the public into consideration, legal responsibility concerning individuals leading a parasitical way of life, malicious speculators and recidivists was increased. Officials were made responsible for the nonfulfillment of court sentences which deprive some citizens of the right to hold certain positions or engage in certain activities. The purpose of such steps is to prevent appointing to materially responsible positions and sectors involving the education of the working people untrustworthy people of doubtful reputation.

The rights of labor collectives and public organizations in the area of justice have been broadened. They were given the right not only to petition

the courts to take on probation delinquents with suspended sentences but to refuse probation and to demand actual punishment whenever such delinquents have scorned the trust of their comrades and violated public order or labor discipline. The party calls upon taking even more fully into consideration the views of labor collectives and critical articles in the press and to use methods of persuasion and the power of the law--all the means at the disposal of society--in strengthening law and order.

We can note with satisfaction that for millions of Soviet citizens the voluntary and conscious observance of the laws is ordinary practice. The working people are becoming less tolerant of various deviations from behavioral norms. Alongside the state authorities, the people's units watch over law and order. Comrade courts, people's control posts, Komsomol "beacons" and other independent organizations are operating at enterprises, construction projects, kolkhozes and sovkhoses. This is yielding positive results.

The legal climate inherent in the USSR and the other socialist countries is in sharp contrast to the reality of many capitalist countries, the United States above all, where according to American officials acts of violence, robbery and terrorism have made life in the big cities a nightmare.

These contrasts are the result of the different social conditions inherent in socialism and capitalism. This is the essence. The defenders of capitalism may make as much noise as they wish about "rights and freedoms," "equal opportunity" and other charms of the "free world" which set the teeth on edge. However, if millions of people are unemployed and have no means of existence, if many of them have no housing and if society does not provide the children of the working people with education or the necessary medical assistance to their families and if it is contaminated by racial prejudice it would be difficult to expect them to show civic virtues.

Conversely, the socialist system and its way of life objectively provide the necessary material and spiritual prerequisites for surmounting and totally eliminating criminal actions. Our population's socio-living conditions are steadily improving; its cultural and educational standards are rising and unemployment disappeared a long time ago. The more than 66-year-old practical experience of the Soviet state and the experience of the fraternal socialist countries convincingly prove that under the conditions of the new society criminality is not fatally inevitable. The socialist system, particularly at the stage of its maturity, has the possibilities of drastically curtailing delinquencies providing that all the units within its governmental and social system engage in their prevention on a steady and coordinated basis.

A convincing illustration of this fact is found in many labor collectives, rayons and cities; this particularly applies to Moscow enterprises such as Khromatron, Mikromashina, the Automotive Vehicles Plant imeni I. A. Likhachev and others. A steady drop in delinquency at work and in daily life has been noted here over a long period of time. Noteworthy is the comprehensive approach to crime prevention among adolescents in the Bashkir ASSR and in Ivanovo and some other oblasts, yielding tangible results.

However, in many cities, oblasts and republics antisocial and criminal actions are noticeably widespread. We are concerned by encroachments on socialist property and the health and dignity of Soviet citizens, manifestations of hooliganism, parasitism and drunkenness. The course of strengthening labor discipline, uprooting delinquency and establishing in each collective and microrayon model public order is not being systematically pursued everywhere.

In a number of sectors legality in economic relations leaves something to be desired. As we know, the importance of the strict observance of legal norms and planning and contractual discipline increases with the growth and increased complexity of economic relations. Today the level of discipline and order in production and in economic relations largely determines the development of the national economy. Of late this obvious public production reserve has been used more extensively and fully. This is substantially influencing the rhythmical and harmonious work of the entire economic organism and is an additional incentive in maintaining and improving the legal climate in the labor collectives. Nevertheless, to this day most of the extensive damages, which are the result of legal nihilism, appear in economic management.

In 1983 the RSFSR State Arbitration authorities reviewed thousands of cases involving violation of planned assignments and contractual obligations by enterprises of the RSFSR Ministry of Light Industry. The amount of penalties ran into tens of millions of rubles. A number of violations of contractual obligations were committed by enterprises of the republic's ministries of food, textile, meat and dairy industries, construction material industry and some other departments. There have been frequent cases of faulty work, violations of state standard stipulations and unplanned shipment of commodities. For example, the Rostovstroyaterialy Production Association arbitrarily shipped out gypsum plates, which were in short supply, instead of meeting the planned needs of consumers. The necessary procurement discipline is also lacking at some enterprises in the local, metallurgical and timber processing industries.

Negligence, waste and violations of environmental protection legislation seriously harm the economy. As a result of gross violations of technological discipline ammonia was released into the Dnepr River by the Dorogobuzh Nitrogen Fertilizers Plant, as a result of which masses of fish died and the damage exceeded 480,000 rubles. Although the culprits were criminally prosecuted, the damage caused to nature is not so easy to correct.

Cases of cheating the state and inflating figures of the actual volume of work done still exist. In order to create the appearance of success, frequently reports submitted to the state on the implementation of marketing plans by enterprises and organizations include fictitious sales. Thus, in May 1983 the Obukhovo Carpet Production Association submitted fictitious accounts for sales totaling 76,300 rubles and included this amount in its production marketing plan, although in fact no such items had been shipped to the consumers. Considerable padding of figures in transportation and payment documents is allowed by the sovkhozes of the RSFSR ministries of agriculture and fruits and vegetables and the procurement organizations of the consumer cooperative.



Let us also point out that those unscrupulous managers who allow figure padding for their selfish purposes corrupt their subordinates and create conditions for the waste of the people's property and for a variety of machinations. In a single year consumers filed claims for 47,500 rubles with the Tea Weighing Factory in Ufa, which was the value of unprocured tea, although according to official enterprise accounts everything seemed in order. A large group of thieves was exposed and prosecuted here.

The party and government documents, which were adopted after the 26th CPSU Congress, reemphasize the need for the skillful utilization of the tremendous possibilities of developed socialism--spiritual, economic and organizational--legal--in strengthening law and order and eliminating criminality. In describing the main trends in drafting the new edition of the CPSU program, Comrade K. U. Chernenko pointed out, among other things, that "we must proceed from existing reality, from what practical experience, public thinking and the collective experience of the masses have indicated." The program must encourage extensive and highly intense efforts to perfect socialism and to seek specific means of resolving the various and complex problems created by our very life.

Such problems include eliminating violations of law and order particularly in their extreme manifestation--crime. In developing Lenin's ideas, Soviet legal thinking and social science have enriched the practice of basic research. They have concretized the strategic line aimed at eliminating crime and delinquent behavior, based on the comprehensive influence of social prevention and legal instruments.

The party documents have frequently indicated the importance of strengthening the united front of state bodies and social forces in the prevention and elimination of delinquency. In the spirit of this stipulation, the labor collectives have set up prevention and legal education councils; the microrayons have established support centers for the preservation of public order. In the Russian Federation, as in other republics, the movement "For a Settlement Without Delinquency" is spreading. Of late, particularly after the enactment of the USSR Law on Labor Collectives, the preventive measures are beginning to be included in the plans for the economic and social development of enterprises, kolkhozes, rayons and cities. The role of labor collectives and trade union and other voluntary organizations in strengthening labor discipline and in the struggle for the protection of socialist property has been enhanced.

However, occasionally violations and shortcuts still occur in some places in preventive and law observance activities. On the one hand, the coordination of actions with law enforcement authorities and public organizations is still poorly secured. Frequently, preventive measures are sporadic and uncoordinated, unsupported with material facilities. In a number of places the formation of public units is being artificially hastened. There is enthusiasm for creating a variety of councils, commissions and staffs while little attention is being paid to enhancing the authority and activeness of existing voluntary organizations, training the social aktiv and encouraging the best. As a result, many people's units, comrade courts and people's control posts have operated far below capacity, displaying inertia and

timidity in using their possibilities. The following situation is frequently noted: violations of labor discipline and order at enterprises or organizations number in the dozens while their discussion in comrade courts is only sporadic.

Hundreds of cases of absenteeism and violations of public order took place in 1983 in the electrical engineering shop in Andropov City, which has 16 comrade courts, and where many workers spend time in medical detoxification facilities. However, most of the violators (more than 80 percent) were ignored by the comrade courts. The work of many rural comrade courts in Arkhangelsk Oblast is no better. For example, low labor discipline prevails at Vilegodskiy Sovkhoz, yet the comrade court has considered only 13 cases although the number of violators is several times higher.

The stipulated legislative measures for material and moral influence, which includes loss of competition ratings and bonuses and travel vouchers to rest homes, taking annual leave in autumn or winter, and loss of priority in housing, are by far not always applied to drifters, drunks and parasites.

Some managers, who ignore the principles of voluntary public work, assign all kinds of projects to workers and employees to the detriment of the production process. Cases of a thoughtless attitude in assessing the activities of public workers were severely criticized at a recent rally of public order unit members in Moscow Oblast; in particular, some plants grant additional leave to unit members, as stipulated by the law, regardless of their individual contribution to law enforcement, exclusively on the basis of their official membership.

The decisive aspect of law enforcement--social prevention--must be substantially strengthened, for it is the foundation for scientific organization in the struggle against antisocial behavior. Naturally, this does not lower the special role and responsibility of law enforcement organs, such as the courts, the militia, the prosecutor's office or other legal establishments which watch over law enforcement in promoting the party's policy. By relying on the public and its educational and preventive potential, they can and must ensure the maximal effectiveness of Soviet laws. The proper and strict implementation of legislative norms, the inevitability of juridical responsibility and strict control over the observance of laws by all citizens and officials is a task of prime importance. In improving their professional activities, courts and other law enforcement organs emphasize the prompt exposure of criminals and the prevention of violations by sensibly and skillfully combining methods of persuasion and coercion and ensuring the strict observance of socialist legality in dispensing justice.

The strictness of the law in the case of dangerous criminals, but trust in those who have accidentally made an error are principles of socialist justice which have been further developed in recent legislation and in the practical work of investigative-prosecuting and judicial authorities. Today as a whole a stricter legal assessment is provided of group or recurrent crimes, large-scale theft of people's property, bribery, black marketeering, malicious parasitism and hooliganism. Investigations and court trials are becoming more efficient and skillful and greater material damages are collected.

Meanwhile, cases of unjustified liberalism and tolerance of antisocial elements, including recidivists, thieves who have stolen socialist property, various types of parasites and individuals guilty of abuses in the service industry are still encountered in legal practice.

Particular attention should be paid to upgrading the efficiency of the levers of the law in material production. It is no secret that in many places law enforcement personnel tolerate figure padding and manifestations of negligence and waste. Frequently, limiting themselves to noting cases of slackness and misuse, they do not demand of the culprits full compensation for material damages. Some officials in construction, transportation and other organizations, guilty of account padding or illegally obtained bonuses, remain essentially unpunished. For several years the courts in the Karelian ASSR and in Orel and Orenburg oblasts tried no criminal cases of figure padding, although the USSR Gosbank proved that figures on the amount of construction projects had been padded by millions of rubles. Losses from theft and negligence, particularly at enterprises of the agroindustrial complex, are being recovered quite unsatisfactorily. Nearly one-half of all write-offs of losses from shortages, theft, and loss of products in the Kalmyk ASSR and Vladimir and Kaluga oblasts are in agriculture. This includes quite considerable nonrecoverable losses in animal husbandry.

The impression develops that instead of trying to expose the culprits and ensure compensation for the damages caused, some economic managers would rather look for ways to write off shortages as production losses, explaining this with a variety of "objective" reasons. Many economic and moral losses are the result of the slack observance of stipulated rules in the various household service sectors, and abuses in trade and in communal and medical services. This applies to violations of housing legislation and shameful cases of extortion and illegal charges extracted from citizens for various services. Obviously, in such cases admonitions or appeals to the conscience do not help.

It is only the effect of the law, inevitable and strict, which could block slackness, whitewashing and bribery. The special legal responsibility of party members, managers and officials is defined above all by their place in society. The powers of officials are not indulgences from responsibility. On the contrary, such powers impose additional obligations on officials. They must set examples of scrupulousness, modesty and respect for the law. They must struggle not with words but with actions against violations of discipline and order regardless of who commits them. As confirmed by legal practice, the position of the managers and their personal example play a determining role in the development of a moral-legal atmosphere in the collectives. It is precisely under the wing of those who have become contaminated with legal nihilism, who are not reluctant to benefit at the expense of the state or, let us say, to ascribe damages suffered by his own carelessness to production losses that all kinds of dealers, machinators and thieves make their nests.

Unfortunately, we must point out that we still come across cases of double standards in assessing violations of the law by ordinary citizens and leading personnel and party members. Instead of adopting a principle-minded and



exigent position, some managers assume the unseemly role of petitioners and defenders of whitewashers and thieves. In this connection it would be pertinent to recall Lenin's attitude toward attempts to protect officials guilty of abuse, who are party members. He wrote to the RKP(b) Central Committee Politburo that "this is not the first time that the Moscow Committee (including Comrade Zelenskiy) is indulging party members who are criminals.... This is qualified as an 'error.' The danger of such 'errors,' is however tremendous" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 53).

The decisions of CPSU Central Committee plenums and the recently passed laws constitute a truly Leninist approach to the problem of legality. They confirm the stricter requirements facing all members of society and, above all, those who have power, who have been entrusted with heading collectives and educating people. The party's stipulations have strengthened the effectiveness of Soviet laws. They are directing the cadres toward a more critical evaluation of the negative aspects of legality and ensuring more efficiently the unity between words and actions.

The party organizations and committees must efficiently implement the CPSU Central Committee instructions on upgrading the role on managing the development of the law and increasing the role of soviets in supervising the observance of laws and decisions. "No one has the right to violate or circumvent our laws," Comrade K. U. Chernenko emphasized at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The stipulation of strengthening legality is reflected in the activities of many rayon, city and oblast soviets in the Russian Federation. The republic's Supreme Soviet, its presidium and commissions and the RSFSR Council of Ministers regularly discuss problems of strengthening law and order in cities and oblasts and ensuring the protection of socialist property. They hear reports submitted by heads of ministries and departments and law enforcement agencies and executive committees of local soviets. During the past year alone reports were submitted to the RSFSR government from the Rostov, Kurgan, Novgorod and Penza oblast executive committees, the Krasnoyarsk Kray Executive Committee and the Council of Ministers of the Mari ASSR; comprehensive measures were considered and approved on intensifying the struggle against delinquents in the Nonchernozem area, improving educational and prevention work among adolescents and struggling against drunkenness and parasitism. The main attention is concentrated on increasing live organizational work, control and verification of execution of the laws and government decisions and enhancing the individual responsibility of cadres for the condition of legality. We know that the effectiveness of all norms of social life, including legal ones, is not achieved automatically but as a result of tireless organizational and ideological-political work among the masses.

As we pointed out, the principal method for eliminating criminal and other antisocial actions is to improve social prevention and to strengthen public monitoring of the execution of laws. We must rally even more closely and channel into the prevention of delinquencies the efforts of soviet and law enforcement bodies, the public at large, the family and the school. The material roots of crime have been long and thoroughly extracted from our



society. Furthermore, as an instrument of social justice, the law has become the moral value of the whole people.

More than ever before priority is given today to the task of providing ideological support for legality, the education of the people and the enhancement of their legal knowledge. "...In addition to the law," Lenin pointed out, "there also is the cultural standard which no law can regulate" (op. cit., vol 38, p 170). Practical experience confirms that respect for the law and its stipulations is the determining reason for proper behavior. The organic unity of moral and ideological-legal views of the Soviet people and their support of the law are the prime motivations for observing law and order.

We must remember that backward and petit bourgeois views and distorted concepts of the correlation between public and individual values and interests remain during the mature socialist stage as well. They come from the outside and have their own social roots, for the awareness of the people, including their legal awareness, is subject to qualitatively different positive and negative influences: socialist organized channels and means of molding the individual, which help him to adopt a Marxist-Leninist ideology (and laws) and the so-called informal and very heterogeneous environment which, although subject to positive changes in the course of social progress, sometimes implants and supports views and feelings incompatible with socialist ideology.

This is the reason for the most essential faults in the area of legal awareness. Although the moral aspect of the Soviet person and his attitude toward the law are shaped by the socialist way of life, it is precisely communist upbringing and the assertion of a socialist legal ideology which play an essential role as our society ascends to new and higher levels. Lenin directed party members and cadres toward systematic education work to surmount petit bourgeois habits and views and to explain the importance of Soviet laws. "First of all we must persuade and then coerce. At all cost we must first persuade and then coerce," Lenin said (op. cit., vol 43, p 54). It is only with a purposeful molding of a socialist consciousness, he pointed out, that the broad masses of workers and peasants will prove themselves "through their independent, quick and efficient participation...in supervising the observance of legality" (op. cit., vol 44, p 337).

Under contemporary conditions, when the role of the legal regulation of social processes and the influence of the law on the development of new forms of labor and relations among people are enhanced, and when the participation of the citizens in social and governmental life increases, imparting legal knowledge becomes increasingly important. The more conscientious the attitude of the citizens becomes toward the stipulations of the law, which express the interests and the will of the people, the greater will become their social activeness and the stronger will discipline and order become in the state.

The negative consequences of ignorance of the laws, not to mention their disregard by society and the individual, are equally obvious. Hence the relevance of Lenin's instruction on the need for comprehensive legal training and upbringing of the population in order to teach the citizens "to struggle for their rights in accordance with all the legal rules of the war waged for

the law, which is legitimate in the RSFSR" (op. cit., vol 53, p 149), as well as developing in every member of society the inner need to check his actions with the stipulations of the law and "sacredly to observe the laws and regulations of the Soviet system" (op. cit., vol 39, p 155).

Most favorable conditions have been provided in our country for imparting legal knowledge to the population. The general cultural standard and political consciousness of the Soviet people and their activeness in managing social and governmental affairs are growing. An increasingly broad circle of citizens is competently participating in the discussion of draft laws. Letters and suggestions on improving legal work are being addressed to the central and local authorities. The population shows great interest in publications, lectures, reports and talks on legal topics and in law books. Consultation-reference work among the population and the study of legislation in permanent circles and courses are improving.

People's universities for legal knowledge have become quite popular in the republic; there are currently some 3,000 of them, attended by more than 700,000 people. Legal topics are beginning to be included in the curricula of party and Komsomol political education courses and institutes and in courses for upgrading the skills of economic cadres. Greater attention is being paid to the legal education of adolescents, students in particular. The foundations of the state and law have become a separate subject in higher and general education schools and in the vocational-technical training system. More than 6 million secondary and higher school students are taking a course in the law.

Following the adoption of the USSR Constitution in 1977, some autonomous republics and oblasts undertook the universal legal training of the population. Today moral-legal problems are being given better coverage by the mass media and in works of fiction, the theater and motion pictures. It is an important fact that our press is not only providing the population with the necessary legal information but is engaging in serious educational and prevention work.

The preventive activities of law enforcement agencies are increasing. Currently 20 percent of all trials are held on site, in worker halls and places of residence. However, this problem should not be simplified, the more so since problems related to improving the entire legal education process must be resolved. Considerable strata, including workers in small production collectives and small service enterprises and many rural residents still remain outside the legal education network. Ideological and legal institutions are still frequently ignoring people with little knowledge of the law, who tend to commit antisocial actions.

Developing respect for the law would remain a pious wish without explaining the social nature, the specific meaning of our legislation. Purposeful juridical and moral-legal training is a single indivisible process. The road to developing legal awareness goes from knowledge to conviction and the habit of acting fully in accordance with the law.

The good experience in organizing universal legal training of the population on a planned basis should be comprehensively disseminated. Let us consider the example of the Mari ASSR. The plan for the economic and social development of that republic includes the "Legal Education" section.

Here more than 1,000 economic managers, 1,500 people's jurors, more than 15,000 volunteer civilian policemen, more than 2,000 members of comrade courts and more than 14,000 people's controllers have studied the law. The legal training of chairmen, deputy chairmen and secretaries of executive committees of rayon and city soviets of people's deputies was organized. Legal consultations during sessions are organized for deputies of the republic's supreme soviet and the rayon and city soviets. Law courses for leading cadres have been organized in the republic's economic ministries and state committees. Such work is having a positive impact on legality. Over the past 3 years cases of violations of the law in the republic have decreased by one-half. The quality and efficiency of legal documents and, in particular, kolkhoz and sovkhoz regulations on loss compensations, have improved. Above all, cases of negligence have declined. Also noteworthy is the fact that during that time the number of granted requests for restoration to work has been reduced by nearly one-half.

The work of the legal education system and the legal training measures must be more clearly oriented toward the prevention of violations and providing the people with the knowledge they need for the performance of their official and social functions, for state, economic, organizational, cultural-educational, social and other activities will become more fruitful if citizens and officials suitably master their specific rights and obligations, have a clear idea of the necessary behavior under specific situations and are able to make real use of the opportunities offered by our democratic institutions.

Let us take as an example the participation of the citizen in public affairs. The role of the people's deputies has increased in drafting and applying laws. The number of permanent commissions alone exceeds more than 330,000 today. They include over 1.8 million deputies and some 2.6 million activists. As we pointed out, millions of working people are members of voluntary public bodies, voluntary people's units, comrade courts and commissions for the observance of socialist legality. We must continue to see to it that the Soviet people participate in state and public life even more energetically and knowledgeably.

It would be expedient to provide firm legal knowledge above all to those who, by virtue of their official position and social obligations, are directly involved in applying the law, such as soviet deputies, state apparatus personnel, trade union workers and the activists of the social and voluntary organizations of working people. Many citizens are directly involved in production management; we have a large detachment of specialists and managers of enterprises and establishments. Clearly, the successful implementation of CPSU economic policy largely depends on the level of legal control exercised in economic relations, strengthening legality in management units and creating a favorable moral-legal climate in each labor collective.

The purpose of legal propaganda is to interpret more extensively the unity of Leninist principles of legality and their internationalist nature and decisively to oppose all manifestations of parochialism and separatism. It is important to bear all of this in mind, for some economic personnel allow illegal actions to be committed either because of ignorance of the law or the inability and unwillingness to be guided by legal norms. Every year a substantial number of orders and directives issued in violation of the law are annulled by representation of the prosecutor's supervisory authorities. The time has come to develop a special governmental system for upgrading the legal knowledge of the managerial and administrative personnel, starting perhaps with the national economy. We believe that it would be expedient for all basic management categories to have a mandatory minimum of legal knowledge without which corresponding positions could not be held.

We should continue to pay particular attention to the moral-legal upbringing of young people. The school reform opens great opportunities for radical improvements in this work. Already in general education and vocational technical schools the young people must become thoroughly familiar with the stipulations of the constitution and the Soviet laws and the moral-legal values of our society and to develop feelings of civic-mindedness and responsibility.

Upgrading the prevention results, preventing delinquency and crime and strengthening legality, discipline and order everywhere--in production, public places and settlements--remains the most important task in legal education. It is insufficient to acquaint the people with the meaning and requirements of the laws. One must also visibly prove their real significance to society and the individual and the importance of the direct participation of everyone in maintaining legality. The objective here is lofty and noble: not merely to train legal "experts" but interested and competent "fighters on the legal front," actively countering hooliganism, drunkenness, abuses and parasitism. The purpose of legal propaganda is to assist more actively the development within each collective, at school and at work, in each microrayon, an atmosphere of general intolerance of those who violate the rules of socialist community life and to subject them to a moral boycott. We must popularize more extensively and clearly the stipulations of Article 65 of the USSR Constitution, according to which it is the duty of every citizen to be intolerant of antisocial actions and comprehensively to contribute to the observance of public order.

We know that a link exists between awareness of the law and legality. Awareness of the law not only influences the level of discipline and order but the condition of legality and the correctness of the activities of law enforcement agencies. In turn, this influences the development of a legal awareness in the people, i.e., of their attitude toward the law and its practice. Lenin repeatedly emphasized the latter. He considered the courts not only a means of struggle against crime but, above all, a tool for "training the population in labor discipline" (op. cit., vol 36, p 163).

In defending the political, economic and cultural gains of socialism and the laws and legitimate interests of the members of our society, the Soviet courts must develop a legal awareness with its inherent humanism, justice and



collectivism. As a frightening weapon for coercion against the enemies of the Soviet homeland, spies and murderers and all kinds of recidivist and other malicious criminals, our people's courts are resolving previously unheard-of human problems, including those of educational and preventive value. One of them is to rehabilitate the people who have violated the laws and to exclude any future possibility of their clashing with society.

In propaganda work we must bring to light more extensively the nationwide nature of the organs of socialist justice. We must promote respect for their difficult and noble toil and encourage the development of relations between the working people and Komsomol and other public organizations with the militia, the prosecutor's office and the judiciary.

Legal education is also a sector of ideological work and has its foreign policy aspect. The development of legal education proves to the entire world that even in the area of the law the Soviet state relies less on coercion than on the conscious discipline of the working people. In organizing legal propaganda we must not ignore the intensified psychological warfare waged by imperialism against real socialism. Using the monopoly of information media in the capitalist countries and with a powerful propaganda apparatus at their disposal, the imperialist circles, the United States in particular, have organized a large chorus of anti-Soviets, ranging from cadre workers of intelligence services to reactionary clergymen, and fill the air and the press with most base fabrications about Soviet reality, including the legal area.

That is why we must also further enhance the class consciousness and vigilance of the Soviet citizens. We must expose the falseness and hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy and the mass and gross violations of basic human rights in capitalist countries. We must disseminate among the masses even more extensively and persistently the truth of the superiority of the political-legal institutions of socialism and the Soviet way of life. The duty of the legal propagandists is to describe the full greatness of the Leninist principles of socialist legality and the fundamental law of the first socialist country--the USSR Constitution--which codified the historical accomplishments of the Soviet people and inaugurated a new stage in the development of socialist democracy and which is enhancing even further the dignity of the working person, the citizen of the land of the soviets.

The more extensively and substantively the working people master a knowledge of Soviet legislation and the more responsively they behave toward its requirements, the greater will become their contribution to the cause of progress and the blossoming of our great homeland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/15

## LENINIST APPROACH TO ANALYZING DEVELOPMENTS IN PHYSICS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) pp 77-86

[Article by Academician I. Kikoin, twice Hero of Socialist Labor and laureate of the Lenin and USSR State Prizes]

[Text] This year, the Soviet scientists and, I believe, many progressive scientists in other countries will be marking the 75th anniversary of the publication of V. I. Lenin's book "Materialism and Empiriocriticism." He wrote this book in foreign exile, when social and political reaction dominated Russia in the aftermath of the defeat of the 1905-1907 revolution and when it seemed that the party faced particularly urgent not philosophical but practical political problems.

Somewhat later, in 1911, Lenin himself explained the reasons which inspired him to create his main philosophical work: "The time of social and political reaction, the time of 'digesting' the rich lessons of the revolution, is not accidentally also a time when fundamental theoretical, including philosophical, problems in all active directions assume priority." He further wrote that "therefore, a philosophical 'analysis' for precisely the progressive Russian class was necessary and there is nothing strange in the fact that this delayed 'analysis' was made after that same progressive class had reached full maturity in the course of the recent great events in playing its autonomous historical role.... This philosophical 'analysis' had been coming for quite some time..., since, for example, the new physics posed a number of new questions with which dialectical materialism had to 'cope'" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 20, p 128).

Indeed, Lenin "coped," superbly at that, with this problem in his classical work "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," by providing an exhaustive philosophical analysis of the condition of the development of physics between the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. The permanent value of this work lies, among others, in the fact that it provides a general method for analyzing the development of science whatever its stage. In the struggle against the overt party opponents and some noted representatives of the sociodemocratic intelligentsia, who were ideologically subverting the party from within, Lenin defended the theoretical foundations of Marxism and the principles of dialectical materialism against the Machist efforts to revise them. As we know, this struggle played a decisive role in the further

assertion of a principle-minded bolshevik line in the Russian revolutionary movement. It was also of international significance, for it helped to refute the claims of the opportunistic leaders of the Second International to the effect that philosophical views of the individual party members are their private affair and that one could be a Marxist without being a dialectical materialist.

To natural scientists, Lenin's work "Materialism and Empiriocism," was (and still is) particularly valuable. It offers the possibility of a proper philosophical interpretation of new discoveries in the natural sciences. With the passage of time interest in this work has not only not abated but, under the conditions of the contemporary aggravated ideological struggle, has become even greater.

The achievements of the scientific and technical revolution and worsened international relations again and again direct us to the question of adopting a truly scientific approach to the study of the development of society and science. It would be pertinent at this point to recall Comrade K. U. Chernenko's words that "naturally, new facts may lead to the need to expand and refine existing views. However, some truths cannot be revised and some problems have been long and simply resolved. While remaining on scientific grounds, we cannot 'forget' the fundamental principles of dialectical materialism."

What were the problems which the new physics posed at the turn of the century, with which Lenin had to "cope?" In his book he listed the tremendous and dizzying successes achieved by the natural sciences during the last 3 decades of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Indeed, that period had been marked by the completion of the so-called physics. It was precisely then that the scientists were able to blend together its three areas--electricity, magnetism and optics.

The electromagnetic theory of light was developed by the British scientist Maxwell. Its triumphant entry into science was paralleled by an interpretation of a tremendous number of various natural phenomena. The invention of the radio by A. S. Popov marked the apotheosis of this theory.

Such outstanding scientific achievements allowed the patriarch of 19th century physics, Lord Kelvin (William Thompson) to state that the "physical firmament" was pure and clear with the exception of two small "clouds" which would most likely scatter soon.

One of the "clouds" was the result obtained by Michaelson in his efforts to find differences in the speed of light in the course of movement by a light recipient toward the source of light or away from it. It turned out that in either case the speed was identical. This fact clearly contradicted classical mechanics.

The other "cloud" pertained to a rather delicate question: that of the structure of radiation of heated solid and liquid bodies. Without going into the details of such a seemingly simple phenomenon, let us point out that classical physics was unable to explain it.

Classical physics found itself in a state of irreconcilable contradiction with the new experimental data. Two new revolutionary trends developed in physics from the "small clouds" mentioned by Kelvin: the theory of relativity and quantum mechanics. Let us recall that the term itself "theory of relativity" appeared later and the work of Albert Einstein, its author, had the very "prosaic" title "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies." The new theory made the greatest revolution in physics. It was taking its initial steps while Lenin was writing his work, and had even made some physicists indignant. Most of them were unable to understand it.

Let us add that X-rays and radioactivity were discovered at the very end of the 19th century. Radioactivity was tremendously puzzling to physicists and chemists. The nature of X-rays was explained only in 1913, when it was established that they were nothing but electromagnetic radiation with a long wave several times smaller than in the visible light spectrum.

Therefore, there was a break in the basic concepts of physics at the turn of the century.

In his work, V. I. Lenin quotes from "The Value of Science," a book by the noted French mathematician and physicist Henri Poincare, according to which "symptoms of a serious crisis" in physics exist. "This crisis is not exhausted by the fact that the 'great revolutionary--radium' undermines the principle of the preservation of energy. 'All other principles are threatened as well'." He further states that "the foundations of mechanics are undermined, Newton's principle of equality between action and counteraction is undermined, and so on. We are faced," Poincare says, with "the 'wreckage' of the old principles of physics and with a 'universal routing of the principles'" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 18, pp 266-267). However, Poincare had assessed more or less accurately the situation which had developed in physics but had reached entirely erroneous philosophical conclusions according to which "it is not nature which gives us (or imposes upon us) the concepts of space and time but it is we who impose them on nature;" "anything which is not thought is pure nothing." Lenin wrote on this subject that "these are idealistic conclusions. The collapse of basic principles themselves indicates (as Poincare thinks) that these principles are not duplicate photographs of nature or depictions of something external in terms of the human mind but products of the mind itself" (ibid.). This led Lenin to describe Poincare as a "major physicist and petty philosopher:" "...for essentially Poincare's 'original' theory is reduced to a rejection (although far from consistent) of objective reality and objective natural laws" (ibid., p 170).

The difficulty with which the scientists had to accept radically new ideas can be seen from the fact that even H. Lorentz, the spiritual head of physics at the turn of our century, who provided the theory of relativity with its most powerful weapon--the so-called "Lorentz conversion"--was unable to understand its meaning immediately. Thus, in his lectures on electronic theory he wrote that "I cannot discuss here the numerous and highly interesting applications which Einstein derived from his principle." He also said that "naturally, in this case he demands of us to believe in advance that the negative results of the experiments such as those conducted by Michaelson, Rayleigh and Bras, are



not an accidental compensation for opposite effects but an expression of a general and a fundamental principle" (H. A. Lorentz, "Teoriya Elektronov i Yeye Primeneniye k Yavleniyam Sveta i Teplovogo Izlucheniya" [The Theory of Electrons and Its Application to Phenomena of Light and Heat Radiation], Moscow, 1953, pp 332-333).

A few years later, Lorentz revised his viewpoint and properly assessed the theory of relativity. It is amazing that its main idea was accepted by the scientists with such difficulty. The theory is that in systems moving in relation to each other time develops differently and a single event considered outside bodies moving in relation to each other does not occur at the same time. The essence of the theory of relativity is that both time and space are relative (hence the term "theory of relativity" or, as it is now known, "relativistic mechanics"). In classical mechanics time was absolute.

The difference between the conclusions of classical and relativistic mechanics becomes noticeable only when the speed of the moving bodies approaches that of light in a vacuum--300 million meters per second. For example, in terms of the earth the highest speed is the speed at which our planet rotates around the sun, which equals approximately 30,000 meters per second. Even at such a speed the difference between the conclusions of classical and relativistic mechanics is insignificantly small. However, when in modern accelerators the speed of movement of particles approaches that of light, classical mechanics becomes totally inapplicable.

Today it is well-known that classical mechanics is a particular case of relativistic mechanics.

The difficulty of understanding the radically new idea of the relativity of time is obviously due to the fact that the physicist had no accurate summing-up philosophy. It is pertinent to recall at this point that as early as the end of the 19th century Engels had cautioned that philosophy takes its revenge on the natural sciences whenever the latter abandon it. "...Natural science has advanced so much that it can no longer avoid a dialectical summation" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Work], vol 20, p 14). That is precisely what happened at the turn of the century to a considerable number of physicists, after they had faced new physical facts and ideas. A good illustration of this is the fact that Poincare, who had published a number of mathematical results on the theory of relativity simultaneously with Einstein, was unable to understand the profound physical meaning of the theory. This is the best possible proof that philosophical views can directly influence a specific science.

Today most physicists do not question the fact that, as M. Born says, "Physics needs a summing-up philosophy" (PHILOSOPHICAL QUARTERLY, No 3, 1953, p 139). It was precisely such a summing-up philosophy which Lenin presented in his famous work. What is outstanding is that without being a physicist he was able to appreciate the revolutionary ideas of relativistic mechanics, something which many physicists of that time were unable to accomplish. Referring to the mentioned characteristics of said mechanics, he wrote that "...however unusual the limitations of mechanical laws of motion in a single area of natural phenomena and their subordination to more profound laws of

electromagnetic phenomena, etc., may be, all of this is nothing but a confirmation of dialectical materialism" (op. cit., vol 18, p 276).

V. I. Lenin was able to assess accurately the new revolutionary theory in physics, for he used dialectical materialism as a tool in his study of scientific developments. The limitations of a single article make it impossible to describe in detail the content of this study. In my view, however, some of its most essential features should be mentioned, for both scientific workers and propagandists must have a daily exposure to Lenin's thoughts. In the preface to the second edition of "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," Lenin expressed the hope that the new edition of the work would be useful "as an aid in the study of Marxist philosophy and dialectical materialism and in drawing philosophical conclusions from the latest discoveries in the natural sciences" (ibid., p 12).

In the chapter "The Latest Revolution in the Natural Sciences and Philosophical Idealism," Lenin pointed out that "Ludwig Boltzman," who died in 1906, "was one of the German physicists who systematically opposed the Machist current" (ibid., p 304); he positively referred to claims by this physicist such as "those who think of eliminating atomism with the help of differential equations cannot see the trees for the forest;" "Unless we nurture illusions on the significance of differential equations, there could be no doubt that the picture of the world...nevertheless has to be atomistic...." (ibid., p 306).

Boltzman also opposed an entire school of philosophers and physicists who rejected the atomistic theory. Thus, in a lecture delivered at the University in Leipzig in 1901, the noted physical chemist Ostwald said that the "atomistic theory should have long become smoldered into library ashes" (see M. P. Bronshteyn, "Atomy i Elektrony" [Atoms and Electrons], No 1, Moscow, 1980, p 62).

We find in "Materialism and Empiriocriticism" a devastating criticism of Ostwald's philosophical views.

Lenin paid great attention to the question of causality, pointing out that "it is particularly important in defining a philosophical line" (op. cit., vol 18, p 157). The problem turned out to be quite complex not only for beginners but for major physicists as well. Indeed, one of the cornerstones of quantum mechanics--the foundations of contemporary physics--is the so-called Heisenberg indeterminacy correlation: one cannot determine the place and speed of particles at the same time. In other words, if we tried to stop a particle at any specific point we cannot determine where it will go and at what velocity. Conversely, if we force the particle to move at a given specific velocity, we would be unable to determine its location. In its time, this circumstance led many physicists into the idealistic camp, for it seemed to them that the indeterminacy correlation imposed essential limits on human knowledge. Furthermore, they tried to draw from this correlation the conclusion that events in the microworld are unpredictable in general, i.e., that the principle of causality is violated. In fact, indeterminacy implies neither a violation of this principle nor any restriction on human knowledge.

The fact that it was impossible to indicate simultaneously the coordinates and the velocity of quantum objects in the future, something which we can so successfully do with "classical" objects, was considered to be a violation of the principle of causality. However, quantum mechanics made it possible perfectly to predict the condition of the system defined by the so-called wave function. Regardless of the interpretation given to this function, it satisfies a deterministic equation, as is the case with the classical theory. With the equations of quantum mechanics, an experimenter is able to predict results. Properly applied, such equations have never misled the researchers.

The so-called "violation of the principle of causality" in quantum mechanics is frequently used to substantiate the statistical interpretation of the wave function. Since we cannot discuss in detail this problem, which has been frequently treated in publications, let us cite the opinion of M. Born--the author of the statistical interpretation of the wave function himself: "The frequent assertion to the effect that contemporary physics has lost causality is entirely groundless. It is true that modern physics has either eliminated or modified many traditional ideas; however, it would no longer be a science had it stopped to look for the cause of phenomena" (M. Born. "Natural Philosophy of Cause and Chance," Oxford, 1929, p 4).

Naturally, this is an accurate statement which fully agrees with the materialistic view on causality. "The truly important theoretical and cognitive problems which separate the philosophical trends," Lenin wrote, "is not the extent of accuracy achieved by our descriptions of causal relations or whether or not such descriptions could be expressed in a precise mathematical formula but whether or not the source of our knowledge of such relations lies in the objective laws of nature or the properties of our mind and its inherent ability to distinguish between the materialists Feuerbach, Marx and Engels and the agnostics (Humists) Avenarius and Mach" (op. cit., vol 18, p 164).

We see, therefore, that in itself quantum mechanics offers no reasons for drawing one idealistic conclusion or another from it. If this is nevertheless done by some philosophers and physicists, the reason is their ignorance of dialectics.

In his time Lenin had to struggle against such physicists and philosophers who based their ideas on the latter's statements, and who believed that nature and matter are merely symbols, conventional signs, i.e., the products of our mind. Today fewer and fewer physicists support such extreme idealistic views. A meaningful criticism of the works of such physicists may be found in many works published by Soviet scientists. In particular S. I. Vavilov criticized quite thoroughly the philosophical views of Eddington and Compton, Schrodinger and others. Contemporary physics is developing precisely in the spirit of dialectical materialism. In Vavilov's metaphor, "the creators and active fighters for the new physics who, like the character in Moliere's comedy, who was amazed to find out that he was speaking in prose, had to become convinced that they had begun to speak in the language of dialectics" (S. I. Vavilov, "Lenin and Contemporary Physics," VESTNIK AKADEMII NAUK SSSR, No 3, 1944, p 42).



The point is simply that the phenomena studied in quantum mechanics, i.e., those occurring in the microworld, obeyed laws different from ordinary phenomena in the macroworld. The question of simultaneously establishing the place and velocity of microparticles (neutrons, protons, etc.) is improper as is, for example, the question of the color of the electron. The impossibility of answering such questions does not mean in the least that the possibilities of human knowledge are limited.

Naturally, by no means all the characteristics of matter or laws of nature are known to us. However, the development of physics and other sciences indicates that there is nothing in the world which cannot be studied, determined and understood. The cognitive nature of the material world could also be considered its most important characteristic. Let us recall Lenin's biting remark relative to Petzoldt's claim that "our thinking demands of nature definiteness" in the course of which "simple definiteness" and nature "always observe this requirement:" "The 'empiricists' have filled dozens of pages with such incredible stupidity!" (op. cit., vol 18, p 168).

Let us emphasize that Lenin's attitude toward the definition of scientific concepts was very strict. He considered that such definitions must include the most important features. He also pointed out that "excessively brief definitions, although convenient, for they sum up the essentials, nevertheless remain inadequate, for it is precisely from them that we must derive the very essential features of the phenomenon to be defined" (op. cit., vol 27, p 386). Lenin's formulation of the nature of the gnosiological category of "matter" is a perfect model of a scientific definition of a concept (see op. cit., vol 18, p 131).

The definition and the importance of a concept in physics such as mass is a good illustration of how important the strict definition of newly introduced concepts is. For a long time this created difficulties due to the fact that Newton, who was the first to introduce the concept of mass in mechanics, had given it a very inaccurate definition. The difficulty furthermore was that a mass has, so to say, "two faces:" on the one hand, it is a measure of inertia and, on the other, a measure of the force of attraction among bodies based on the law of universal gravity. Although the inert mass, as computed by Soviet scientists to a 12-digit accuracy, coincides with the gravitation mass, attempts are still being made to find a difference between these two physical values.

Should such a difference be found, it would be of tremendous scientific significance.

However, we must also remember that the mass also appears in a "third face"—the theory of relativity based on Einstein's famous equation which links mass with energy (this equation is the base of nuclear energy). If we limit ourselves to the concept of the inert mass within the framework of Newton's mechanics, the strictest possible definition of it was provided, unlike that of many authors of courses on mechanics, by Boltzman in his 1897 "Lectures on the Principles on Mechanics." The definition is based on the objective law of nature, confirmed through numerous experiments: the ratio of acceleration of two interacting bodies does not depend on any external interaction conditions



or on velocity or the environment in which the bodies are located. It depends exclusively on the properties of the interacting bodies. It is precisely this characteristic which has been described as mass. The ratio of acceleration of bodies is inversely proportional to their mass. It follows from the definition provided by Boltzman that if several bodies are put together, their total mass will equal the sum of masses of all component bodies. If the mass is to be defined by any other method the law of preservation of the mass would be violated. In order to determine the mass of an individual body it is necessary, as is frequently done, to choose the mass of any given body as a unit (a mass standard) and to measure the acceleration of this body and of its interacting standard. In that case the mass of the body will equal the mass of the standard, multiplied by the inverse ratio of accelerations. This method used in defining the concept of mass is the one applied in modern physics. Incidentally, this definition of mass expresses Newton's third law (if we consider that the acceleration of interacting bodies is in the opposite direction).

Quite instructive in this respect is Lenin's rebuke of one of his opponents, who wrote that "in science the concept of matter is reduced to the coefficient of mass used in mechanics equations which, with a precise analysis, proves to be an inverse acceleration value in the interaction between two physical complexes--bodies." It is clear that this author, who failed to understand the meaning of the definition of mass and who believes that it is defined as a ratio of acceleration (which, naturally, does not mean matter), decided that it was thus that the concept of matter was eliminated in physics. He simply failed to understand that in order to obtain a mass the ratio of acceleration must be multiplied by the mass of the body selected as the unit (the standard). Lenin's comment was the following: "Understandably, if any given body is taken as the unit, the (mechanical) motion of all other bodies could be expressed as the simple acceleration ratio. However, 'bodies' (i.e., matter) do not disappear at all as a result of this. They do not stop existing regardless of our mind" (op. cit., vol 18, p 305).

Newton's second law is another example with which to illustrate the principle of causality. We know that with a given size of deformation, an elastically deformed body will act on any other body attached to it with the same force. However, accelerations produced by the same force also depend on the mass. Therefore, if we want to establish a correlation among three physical values--force, mass and acceleration--we can use the principle of causality, formulated as follows: equal forces must trigger equal consequences. In the language of mathematics this means the following: having studied from the movement of bodies of different masses attached to the same body with a given deformation (such as a spring with a specific length of extension or compression), we must find a value which would be identical for all the bodies with any mass. Experiments have proved that such a value was the multiplication of the mass of the body times its acceleration. This proved that for a force of elasticity  $F$  acting on the bodies, the ratio  $F = ma$  would be correct; here  $m$  is the mass and  $a$  is the acceleration of the body. This is the formula which expresses Newton's famous second law.

Relatively simple experiments proved this law to apply to other forces as well.

The most characteristic feature of Lenin's method of analysis of social phenomena, including science, is that Lenin always relied on practical experience as a criterion of truth. He uses Engels' statement in explaining the idea of the "criterion of practice:" "People acted before they began to argue. 'At the beginning was the act'... 'The proof of the pudding is in the eating.' At a time when we use an object in accordance with its characteristics perceived by us we submit to an impeccable test the veracity or falsity of our sensory perceptions.... The success of our actions proves the consistency (Ubereinstimmung) between our perceptions and the material (gegenstandlich) nature of the perceived objects" (op. cit., vol 18, p 109-110).

However, the following question arises here. The history of science abounds with examples confirming the fact that the views of the physicist, which were clearly erroneous from the contemporary viewpoint, led to entirely successful actions. Let us take as an example the old theory of magnetism in which a magnetized bit is considered a magnetic dipole consisting of two magnetic poles or "magnetic charges" (similar to the electric dipole). On the basis of this concept the physicists developed the magnetostatic system on which the entire practice and technology of the use of magnets is based. This practice did not conflict with said theory.

Yet we know that no magnetic charges exist in reality and that if we speak today of magnetic poles we mandatorily stipulate that this is a "fictitious concept." What does this prove? Does it prove a negation of objective truth or the unreliability of the criterion of practice? Naturally, this is no idle question.

In an effort to determine the nature of the philosophical interpretation of a physical law, R. Feinman, one of the greatest theoretical physicists of our time, illustrated the gnosiological importance of the question with the following example: "Let those who insist that the only important thing is harmony between theory and experiment to imagine a conversation between a Mayan astronomer and his student. The Mayans were able to predict eclipses and the position of the moon, Venus and other planets with amazing accuracy. All of this was accomplished with the help of mathematics.... They did not even have the slightest concept of the rotation of celestial bodies.... Imagine a young person coming to our astronomer and saying that 'Here is what I think. Perhaps all of this is rotating. Perhaps these are spheres made of rock...and their motion could be computed in an entirely different fashion.'..." Subsequently, after finding out that the young man had not as yet made such computations, the Mayan astronomer would answer him that as it is we can already compute eclipses quite accurately, for which reason there is no need to go along with his ideas.... "We see, therefore, that the problem of whether or not it is worth considering what lies behind our theories is no easy task" (see R. Feinman, "Kharakter Fizicheskikh Zakonov" [The Nature of Physical Laws]. Moscow, 1968, pp 187-188).

This is in fact a difficult problem which cannot be resolved without a dialectical approach, as was brilliantly accomplished by Lenin. In asserting

that "from the viewpoint of life practical experience must be the first and basic viewpoint in the theory of knowledge," Lenin added the following significant words: "Naturally, we must not forget in this case that the practical criterion can never essentially confirm or refute in full any human concept whatsoever. This criterion is also so 'indefinite,' that it does not allow human knowledge to turn into an 'absolute.' However, it is also so definite that it can be used in waging a merciless struggle against all varieties of idealism and agnosticism. If what our practical experience proves is the only, the final and the objective truth, it means that we acknowledge as the only way to this truth the way of science based on a materialistic viewpoint" (op. cit., vol 18, pp 145-146). This is as good an illustration of the application of the dialectical method to the theory of knowledge as one may wish!

The overwhelming majority of physicists are consciously or spontaneously guided by precisely such an understanding of the "criterion of practice" which Lenin provided.

The difficulty in analyzing the contemporary stage in the development of physics is that we are forced to use concepts about phenomena which are difficult to imagine. Centuries of human experience have led to the fact that, as a rule, man considers understandable that which he can visualize. As long as mankind was dealing with macroscopic objects moving at relatively low speeds, they could be seen, their form (geometric shape) could be defined and their motion could be studied (mechanically). However, after contemporary physics and technology had turned to the world of objects obeying the laws of quantum mechanics, we were deprived of the possibility of imagining the geometric or mechanical aspect of such objects. Quantum mechanics, however, is not merely physics. It is also radio electronics, which is the base of contemporary computers and automation, electronic control systems, laser technology, nuclear power, and many others. The electron and the particles which make the atomic nucleus are no longer simply "particles." In many cases they are also "waves," i.e., something irreconcilable with the particle concept. Naturally, at this point there cannot even be a question of any ordinary geometric or mechanical shape. We are totally unable to imagine what they look like. What is noteworthy is that Lenin, during whose lifetime a number of difficulties related to quantum mechanics had not appeared yet, was never bothered by the wondrously beautiful nature of objects under study or the disparity between them and the ordinary concepts. At the very dawn of the development of contemporary physics, he wrote that "...All of this is much stranger than the old mechanics. Nevertheless, it is a movement of matter in space and time" (ibid., p 298). As we know, Lenin used this "strangeness" as one more proof of dialectical materialism.

The most convincing proof of the fact that Lenin was not bothered by this wondrous beauty is the following statement: "The motion of objects turns in nature into a motion of something that is not a body with a steady mass, a motion of an unknown charge of unknown electricity in an unknown ether. This dialectics of material conversions, taking place in a laboratory or a plant is



used by the idealist (as by the public at large and the Machists) not as confirmation of dialectical materialism but as an argument against materialism..." (ibid., pp 297-298).

Naturally, all of these Leninist ideas must be presented to the broad readership by educators, scientists and propagandists, however difficult this may be. This author can confidently claim that had Lenin had the opportunity to analyze contemporary concepts of quantum mechanics in physics he would find in them as well a splendid confirmation of dialectical materialism.

This question arises: Why did Lenin pay such great attention to the study of the development of physics? The answer is found in the following lines from his excerpt "On the Problem of Dialectics." In speaking of the division of the unity and knowledge into conflicting parts as the essence of dialectics, Lenin remarked: "The accuracy of this aspect of the content of dialectics should be tested through the history of science" (op. cit., vol 29, p 316).

Lenin understood perfectly that physics plays an exceptional role among the numerous natural sciences. The reason is that physics studies the simplest and the most general properties of matter. Such scope and common content of physics should and did take it very close to philosophy.

The degree to which Lenin was excited by the question of ideologically arming the broad masses is confirmed by the fact that 14 years after writing "Materialism and Empiriocriticism," returning to problems of Marxist philosophy in his article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism," he wrote that "the article by A. Timiryazev on Einstein's theory of relativity, which was published in issues 1 and 2 of the journal *POD ZNAMENEM MARKSIZMA*, makes us hope that the journal will be able to achieve this second alliance as well" (referring to the alliance with the representatives of the modern natural sciences--the author). He further said that "whereas in the first issue of the journal Timiryazev had to stipulate that the tremendous majority of members of the bourgeois intelligentsia in all countries were supporting the theory of Einstein, who, himself, according to Timiryazev, had not engaged in any kind of active campaign against the foundations of materialism, this does not apply to Einstein alone but to a number, if not the majority, of great transformers of the natural sciences, starting with the end of the 19th century. In order not to assume an unconscientious attitude toward this phenomenon, we must realize that no natural sciences, no materialism can withstand the struggle against the pressure of bourgeois ideas or the restoration of the bourgeois outlook without solid philosophical substantiation. In order to withstand in this struggle and take it to the end with total success, the natural scientist must also be a contemporary materialist, a conscious supporter of Marx's materialism, i.e., he must be a dialectical materialist" (op. cit., vol 45 pp 29-30).

It was 75 years ago that Lenin wrote that "contemporary physics is in the state of giving birth to dialectical materialism. The process is painful" (op. cit., vol 18, p 332). Today we can claim that such birth pains were



successful. The entire development of present-day physics confirms the accuracy of Lenin's forecast.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/15

**A COMMUNIST AND ARDENT PATRIOT OF THE SOCIALIST MOTHERLAND: ON THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF YU. V. ANDROPOV'S BIRTH**

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) pp 87-96

[Article by P. Laptev and V. Sharapov]

[Text] In December 1983, addressing his party comrades and participants in the routine plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov wrote: "In whatever sector Central Committee members, candidate members and Central Auditing Commission members may work--in government or in sectors of the national economy, in party or soviet organs or in science, in the sphere of culture or in the diplomatic field--we must all constantly remember that we are political leaders and must place the interests of the party and people above all else."

This sense of responsibility of a communist and Leninist was to the highest degree characteristic of Yu. V. Andropov himself. His name and activity are inextricably linked with the Leninist party, inseparable from it.

It sometimes happens that the bare outlines of one person's life story reflect the history of a whole country. That is true of Yuriy Vladimirovich's life story. It begins, in essence, not in the family of a railroad worker at Nagustskaya station in the wide open spaces of the Stavropol region where he was born, nor on 15 June 1914, his date of birth. Its roots lie in the Great October, which radically changed the destiny of Russia's peoples and the personal destinies of working people.

Yu. V. Andropov began his working life early, at the age of 16.

The young man was captivated by the heroism of the busy years of the first five-year plans, years which, though distant, are ever close to the heart of the Soviet person. And he plunged into the masses' work of creating a new life. He plunged in with the open heart and fervor of youth. First he was a telegraph worker, then a cinema mechanic.

Overcoming difficulties, the country, under the Bolshevik Party's leadership, marched confidently forward, along the path of socialist construction. The young generation was tempered in the crucible of revolutionary transformations. The party did much work in the communist education of young

people, increasing their labor and political activeness. The party's ideas and appeals met with a unanimous response among young working people, in whose vanguard the Lenin Komsomol marched. In 1930, Yu. V. Andropov was admitted to the ranks of the Komsomol which reflected his life stance to a significant degree and determined his subsequent career.

Lenin's words to the young generation: "...The task is to learn," (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 298) became deeply imprinted in the hearts of young men and women. As far as the existence of opportunities, Soviet power did all it could to more widely fling open the doors of the schools, technical colleges, and VUZes. Among those who crossed the threshold of the educational establishments in those years, after already gaining experience of socially useful labor, was Yu. V. Andropov. In 1932 he was admitted to the Rybinsk Technical College of Water Transport. In winter he studied, in summer he worked on the steamers--first as a crewman, then as helmsman, and finally as mate. In this way not only did his professional skills grow, but his character was formed and his organizational abilities developed. It was no accident that after completing his studies he was elected full-time secretary of the technical college's Komsomol organization, and was soon appointed Komsomol organizer of the Komsomol Central Committee for the Voldarskiy shipyard in Rybinsk. Yuriy Andropov does not merely labor conscientiously, the newspaper VOLODARETS, organ of the shipyard's party organization bureau, plant committee, and management wrote at the time, he "conducts Komsomol work in the most impassioned way."

Yu. V. Andropov's subsequent development and growth took place in Yaroslavl. In 1937 he was appointed department chief, then elected secretary, and in 1939 first secretary of the Komsomol obkom. It was here that he became a party member. In the party ranks, his talent as a propagandist, organizer, and educator of young people--exacting toward himself and others and at the same time responsive and fair--was revealed still more.

In 1940, Yu. V. Andropov was sent to work in Karelia. He was elected first secretary of the republic's Komsomol Central Committee. The Patriotic War found him there. The front cut through Karelia like a giant sword. But the war for the sacred Soviet land was not waged only in the trenches and at the forward positions. In response to the party's call, it was also launched in the aggressors' rear. Yu. V. Andropov threw himself into the work of organizing the Komsomol underground and the political education of young people in territory temporarily occupied by the enemy, and also of sending combat groups into the enemy's rear and conducting operations there. In the photographs of those years he is shown in an overcoat, among the partisans. There he is addressing the fighters, gesturing energetically, in the way that the commissars and political leaders used to spur the soldiers on to attack.

In 1944, Yu. V. Andropov became engaged in party work: First he was second secretary of Petrozavodsk Gorkom, then second secretary of the RKP(b) Central Committee.

After the end of the war, the tasks of restoring the national economy came to the fore in our party's activity.

Thanks to the tremendous assistance given by the party Central Committee and the Soviet government, selfless work by the republic's working people under the leadership of the party organization, and fraternal assistance from the other peoples of the USSR, by 1950 Karelia's national economy was restored and had entered a period of further development. During these years Yu. V. Andropov was concerned, alongside party organizational and ideological problems, with issues of mechanizing the timber industry, increasing labor productivity, strengthening autonomous financing, and party control in production. "The strength of the party organization," he wrote in PRAVDA for 12 April 1951, "lies in its close ties with the masses. Party control in production can be effective and efficient on condition that the broad masses of working people participate in it alongside leaders and communists with the masses checking on their leaders, pointing out their mistakes, and helping to eliminate shortcomings in work."

In 1951, Yu. V. Andropov was transferred to the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, where he worked as an inspector and as chief of a Central Committee subdepartment, and in 1953 he was sent on diplomatic work. First he was chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry department, and then, from 1954, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Hungarian People's Republic. The activation of counterrevolutionary forces, which, with imperialism's support, staged an uprising in October 1956, demanded resolute actions and a selfless struggle from Hungarian communists. The Soviet ambassador's activity in these emergency conditions and his accurate observations, well-considered proposals, and personal courage were highly assessed by our party and government. The Hungarian communists said to him, "We recognized you as our people's real friend, deeply concerned for the Hungarian people's future and the cause of Hungarian-Soviet friendship."

In early 1957, Yu. V. Andropov returned to Moscow. Major new work awaited him there: He was appointed chief of a CPSU Central Committee department, and in 1962 he was elected secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

By then, socialism as a world system already existed. Through their example, the Soviet Union and the other fraternal countries revolutionized the minds of working people in the capitalist world and inspired the fighters in the national liberation movement, doing much to facilitate their path to victory.

Our party and its Central Committee comprehensively analyzed the experience accumulated in building the new society, the operation of the general laws and the national peculiarities of the socialist revolution, and the formation and development of socialism under specific conditions in different countries. It was also necessary to find answers to new questions that arose in mutual relations and cooperation between the fraternal countries on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism. Yu. V. Andropov actively participated in the collective work of the party and its cadres to resolve these questions.

But once again there came a turning point in Yuriy Vladimirovich's activity. In May 1967, he was appointed chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Committee for State Security, and he held that post for 15 years.



From June 1967, Yu. V. Andropov was a candidate member of the Politburo, and then from April 1973 he was a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

During those years, the Chekists' tasks grew more complex. It was necessary to improve the ways and methods of combatting the sophisticated espionage and subversive activities of the enemy's special services in order to increase the effectiveness of work to ensure the Soviet state's security. Important measures were implemented to this end. All the work of the state security organs was built on Leninist principles, under the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; socialist legality was strictly observed and ties with the working people widened.

In the work of the USSR KGB, determination and implacability in the struggle against the imperialist powers' special services and subversive centers were combined with the utmost attentiveness and a humanitarian attitude where Soviet people were concerned. "The Chekists," Yuriy Vladimirovich said, "are called upon to struggle for every Soviet person when he has gone astray, so as to help him to return to the correct path. That is one of the most important aspects of the state security organs' activity."

Yu. V. Andropov constantly emphasized that the work of the Chekist organs must accord with the historical process of Soviet society's gradual progress, the development of our state of the whole people, and the improvement of socialist democracy. The KGB's activity was assessed highly by the 24th, 25th, and 26th CPSU congresses. "The USSR KGB," it was noted at the 26th Congress, "works efficiently, with a high professional standard, strictly adhering to the provisions of the constitution and the norms of Soviet legislation. The Chekists vigilantly and keenly monitor the intrigues of the imperialist intelligence services. They resolutely cut short the activity of those who embark on the path of antistate, hostile actions and who encroach on Soviet people's rights or Soviet society's interests. This work merits profound recognition from the party and all our people." Yu. V. Andropov's services here were noteworthy.

In May 1982, Yu. V. Andropov was again elected secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He was concerned with issues of the party's ideological work—one of the most important components of communist construction.

Whatever Central Committee mission Yu. V. Andropov was fulfilling, he always stressed that work must without fail take place in line with the party's policy and decisions. He was a party man to the core, devoted to the Leninist style and the principle of collective leadership. And so he could not conceive of any decisions without collective discussion, be they questions concerning the social, economic, ideological, or cultural sphere, the strengthening of the country's defense capability, or the Soviet Union's actions in the international arena. His work and his remarkable personal qualities were highly assessed by the party and the Soviet people. He accumulated great experience of party and state work, had a Marxist-Leninist approach to concrete actions, showing himself to be a real communist, an ardent patriot of our great motherland, and an active fighter for communist ideals.

At the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov was unanimously elected general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and in June 1983, at the 8th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet's 10th convocation, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Yu. V. Andropov made a worthy contribution to the collective activity of the Central Committee and its Politburo in elaborating and implementing the course of improving developed socialism. The November 1982 and June and December 1983 plenums of the CPSU Central Committee took place with his direct participation. The policy line of the 26th CPSU Congress and the party's present-day strategy were developed and concretized in the decisions of these plenums and in Yu. V. Andropov's speeches.

"Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's best political and human qualities were revealed especially vividly in the posts of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said at the CPSU Central Committee February 1984 Plenum. "He did not spare himself, striving always to be worthy of the tasks facing him."

It is well known how much the party managed to do during that short space of time, establishing much that was new and fruitful in society's life.

The efforts of the party and all the people to accelerate economic development, strengthen party, state and labor discipline and increase cadres' responsibility were stepped up still further. The masses' creative activeness and initiative were further developed. The struggle was stepped up against phenomena alien to our society, such as embezzlement, bribery, bureaucracy, and lack of respect for people. It need hardly be said that this met with the Soviet people's interests and helped to consolidate socialism's prestige in the world arena.

All the experience of the Russian proletariat's revolutionary struggle and of building socialism testifies to the importance of Marxist-Leninist theory in choosing the only correct means of achieving the goals set. The CPSU Central Committee under Yu. V. Andropov's leadership continued to study vital theoretical problems. It called on our cadres to perceive the real dynamic of the modern Soviet society, with all its potential and needs.

The elaboration of the concept of developed socialism holds a very important place in the CPSU's theoretical work. On the basis of that concept, the party defines its strategy and tactics and plans the resolution of current and long-term tasks. And this was the question to which Yu. V. Andropov devoted paramount attention. He pointed out that for all the huge successes achieved in socialist building, we still have unresolved problems left over from stages we have passed through. This realistic approach, neither exaggerating nor belittling what has been done, makes it possible to overcome the simplistic idea which used to be popular about the means and scale of our progress. Guided by the scientific, Marxist-Leninist approach to the processes and phenomena of life, Yu. V. Andropov did much work on the all-around substantiation of the party's conclusion that our country is still at the beginning of the lengthy historical stage which is the all-around improvement

of developed socialism. And the party concentrates its attention and creative forces on resolving this strategic task.

On the basis of present-day reality, and of the need to find the correct path for our society's successful transition to new, higher degrees of maturity, the party reached the conclusion that although the CPSU program now in force correctly reflects the laws of social development, some of its provisions have not entirely withstood the test of time. At the CPSU Central Committee June 1983 Plenum, Yu. V. Andropov said that the new edition of the CPSU program should give a realistic analysis of the existing situation and map out clear guidelines for the future, linking the experience of life to the CPSU's great goals. "In present-day conditions," Comrade K. U. Chernenko stressed in his speech at the session of the CPSU Central Committee's commission for preparing the new edition of the CPSU program on 25 April 1984, "our program must be the program of improving developed socialism. In the process of improving developed socialism, the gradual advance toward communism takes place. We must proceed on this basis in all our party work, including work to develop the masses' awareness."

The field of Yu. V. Andropov's theoretical interests included questions of socialist democracy and the ideological struggle and party and state building. He linked theoretical work inextricably with the need to achieve practical results in all sectors of the Soviet people's creative work, devoting the keenest attention to national economic problems.

An important milestone in the life of the party and country was the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Speaking at the plenum, Yu. V. Andropov analyzed in detail both the positive aspects of our economic development and the difficulties and shortcomings which hamper our forward movement.

He stressed the need to accelerate the intensification of the economy, increase its efficiency, and create conditions which will stimulate high quality, productive labor, initiative and enterprise and, conversely, place those who do unsatisfactory work in a disadvantageous position. The party's instructions on strengthening state, labor, and executive discipline, enhancing the standard of organization and efficiency in work, and ensuring strict monitoring of the fulfillment of decisions adopted have had a positive effect on the country's economic and social development.

At his meeting with party veterans at the CPSU Central Committee on 15 August 1983, Yuriy Vladimirovich said that conscious discipline is inherent in the nature of the socialist society, that the struggle to strengthen it is not only confined to administrative control, but depends on well-organized ideological and political education work, and that it must be based on the modern organization of labor, the sensible placing of people, efficient material and technical backup, and the improvement of the forms and means of moral and material incentives. "...The essence of socialist discipline," he noted, "lies in all-out efforts by everyone at his place of work."

The appeals of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum for the strengthening of discipline and order were received with profound understanding by the masses and met with their approval and support. This



matter was vitally necessary for overcoming difficulties and bottlenecks in the economy, developing people's political consciousness, and enhancing their sense of responsibility for their labor and its results, their responsibility to the collective, to society, and to themselves and their own consciences. Without the strengthening of discipline and organization and the improvement of the labor and moral atmosphere, we would not have had the changes for the better which can be seen in many respects, and above all in the fact that our economic march has become broader and more confident. And the party is actively developing this trend.

All our efforts in the sphere of the national economy are ultimately aimed at increasing the people's well-being. The implementation of the social program outlined by the 26th CPSU Congress was invariably linked, in Yu. V. Andropov's speeches, with the resolution of the tasks of improving the efficiency of social production, labor productivity, and work quality. "There is no such thing, as the saying goes, as miracles," he said at his meeting with machine tool building workers at Moscow's Sergo Ordzhonikidze Plant. "You yourselves realize that the state can only provide the goods that are produced. An increase in wages, if it is not backed up by good quality, necessary goods, if, in short, the service sphere is in a bad way, cannot lead to a real increase in material well-being."

In his last speeches Yu. V. Andropov devoted much attention to current affairs and long-term problems in the national economy; he examined the forms, methods, and means of speeding up the implementation of the 26th CPSU Congress decisions and the party's economic policy aimed at enhancing the working people's material and cultural standard of living on the basis of the further growth of labor productivity, social production efficiency, and Soviet people's social and labor activeness. The CPSU Central Committee December 1983 Plenum put forward, on his suggestion, an appeal approved by the party Central Committee Politburo for a 1 percent above-plan increase of labor productivity in 1984 and for a 0.5 percent reduction in the prime cost of output.

Yu. V. Andropov took a lively interest in the course of the large-scale economic experiment in industry, the introduction of the team contract, and the development of autonomous financing relations, seeing them as an important condition of the fulfillment of the economic and social tasks outlined by the party.

He constantly pointed to the importance of accelerating scientific and technical progress and comprehensively improving the economic management machinery--in other words, improving both the organizational structure of management at all levels and in all components of the national economy and the planning system, and enhancing the effectiveness of economic levers and incentives.

In accordance with the party's instructions, the resolution of economic problems, as of all other problems, is associated with the observance of the Leninist principles of selecting, placing and educating cadres. "Very great significance," Yu. V. Andropov noted, "is attached to the careful selection of cadres for their practical and political qualities and the education of real



production organizers, of enterprising, capable workers. The attitude of good will toward them which has become established must be combined to a still greater extent with high exactingness and principle."

Yuriy Vladimirovich devoted constant attention to the implementation of the USSR Constitution and the further development of socialist democracy and our society's entire political system. His articles and speeches examine questions of strengthening the true people's power which was born in October, the Soviet statehood and the working people's socialist self-management. "Socialist democracy," he said, "is not only rights and freedoms. It presupposes every citizen's obligation to society as a whole, presupposes strict discipline." He devoted particular attention to the need to step up the effectiveness of the institutions and the forms of socialist democracy, improve and reduce the management apparatus, and combat departmental and localistic narrow-mindedness.

The party consistently pursues a line of ensuring that the Soviet Constitution's requirements are strictly fulfilled, that the Constitution works successfully and fruitfully for socialism, and that law, order and legality are strengthened. This was vividly expressed in Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speeches to votes on 2 March and at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, and in that plenum's resolution "On Further Improving the Work of the Soviets of People's Deputies." It was stressed that each soviet must persistently enrich the content and improve the style of its activity, effectively realize its potential, and make full use of its constitutional powers.

It is easy to understand what great significance the consistent implementation of the Leninist nationalities policy has in the Soviet people's life. The nationalities question, in the form in which we inherited it from the system of exploitation, has been successfully resolved. As a result of all-around, equal, fraternal cooperation, for the first time in mankind's history the multinational structure of the country has been transformed from a source of weakness into a source of strength and prosperity.

Speaking at the joint ceremonial session of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and RSFSR Supreme Soviet devoted to the USSR's 60th anniversary, Yu. V. Andropov noted that our successes in national building (natsionalnoye stroitelstvo) do not mean that all the problems engendered by the very fact that a multiplicity of nations and ethnic groups live and work within the framework of a single state, have disappeared. In this connection the significance of a scientifically substantiated nationalities policy was stressed. The important task of this policy in the economic sphere is to ensure "the most sensible utilization of each republic's natural resources, manpower, and climatic peculiarities, the most rational incorporation of that potential into the potential of the whole union..." In the sphere of spiritual life, the task is to seek new methods and forms of work which accord with today's demands and enable us to "make the mutual enrichment of cultures still more fruitful and open up for all people even wider access to the best that the culture of each of our peoples has to offer."

One of the most important places in the multifaceted activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state has always belonged to foreign policy questions. Lenin once noted that alongside the building of the working people's state and the new society, "from the very beginning of the October Revolution the question of foreign policy and international relations faced us as the main question..." ("Complete Collected Works," vol 37, p 153). True at that time, when it was a question of whether the republic of soviets could stand firm and preserve its autonomy in the face of the onslaught of the capitalist world, this tenet of Lenin's remains true today, when the USSR has grown and strengthened to a tremendous extent and when the correlation of forces in the international arena has changed radically in favor of the cause of peace and social progress. Successful progress along the path of improving developed socialism depends largely on how the situation develops in the world arena.

Moreover, the threat of nuclear war which hangs over the world prompts us, as Yu. V. Andropov stressed, to reassess the basic meaning of the activity of the entire communist movement. "Communists," he said at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "have always been fighters against oppression and man's exploitation of man, and today they are also struggling to preserve human civilization and for man's right to life."

The CPSU sees it as one of its prime concerns to strengthen the world socialist community. In unity, Yu. V. Andropov stressed repeatedly, is our strength, the guarantee of ultimate success in even the most serious trials. Yuriy Vladimirovich made a significant contribution to the development and deepening of all-around cooperation among the socialist countries and the strengthening of their cohesion in the struggle to avert nuclear catastrophe, which threatens mankind with irremediable consequences. He believed the time had come for the transition to a qualitatively new level of socialist economic integration within CEMA, and he worked indefatigably to strengthen the defensive alliance of the fraternal countries--the Warsaw Pact Organization.

Yu. V. Andropov devoted much effort and skill to the noble cause of the struggle for peace. Speaking at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 22 November 1982, he stressed: "I must say with the utmost sense of responsibility that Soviet foreign policy has been and will remain as it was determined by the decisions of our party's 24th, 25th, and 26th congresses. Ensuring lasting peace and defending the peoples' right to independence and social progress are the immutable goals of our foreign policy. In the struggle for these goals, the party and state leadership will act in a principled, consistent and well-considered way."

For the successful defense of the cause of peace, great significance is attached to the CPSU Central Committee's conclusions on the causes of the present dangerous aggravation of the international situation. It was noted in Yu. V. Andropov's speeches that the responsibility for this rests first and foremost with the Reagan administration, which is trying to discount the interests of other states and peoples and, contrary to the correctly understood interests of the American people themselves, to secure dominant positions for the United States in the world, seeking to reverse the course of history, and threatening socialism with a "crusade." But these calculations

are illusory. The USSR and other socialist countries will continue to live and develop by their own laws--the laws of the most advanced social system.

As for Washington's hopes of achieving military superiority for the United States over the Soviet Union and for NATO over the Warsaw Pact, they are not fated to be realized.

Yu. V. Andropov pointed out that under conditions where the present U.S. Administration is pursuing an aggressive, militarist course aimed at exacerbating the confrontation with the socialist countries and conducting affairs with them from a position of strength and military superiority, it is necessary to adopt every measure to ensure the appropriate defense capability of the USSR and its allies.

It is essential to reckon with the stern realities of the international situation, displaying a high sense of political responsibility and revolutionary vigilance. The Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries are responding to the creation of new strategic arms systems in the United States and the siting of American missiles in Western Europe with measures which prevent the breaking of the established parity. But military rivalry is not socialism's choice. Socialism's ideal is a world without weapons. "We believe," Yu. V. Andropov stated, "that the difficulties and tension which characterize the present-day international situation can and must be overcome. Mankind cannot tolerate the arms race and wars forever, if he does not want to jeopardize his future. The CPSU is against allowing the dispute of ideas to turn into confrontations between states and peoples and allowing weapons and the willingness to resort to them to be the yardstick for measuring the potentialities of social system."

Every great cause creates its own heroes. And the worldwide historical cause of the struggle for the triumph of communist ideas, the working people's happiness, and the safeguarding of mankind's peaceful future has engendered a worthy pleiad of figures in the communist party and the Soviet state. It rightly includes Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, communist, outstanding organizer and leader of the Leninist type. "Organizational talent, a clear, creative mind, loyalty to Leninism in theory and policy, a keen feeling for innovation and the ability to accumulate the masses' living experience, implacability toward all that is alien to our philosophy and way of life; to our morality, and personal charm and modesty." Comrade K. U. Chernenko said at the February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "All this won for Yuriy Vladimirovich tremendous authority and respect in the party and people." The life and activity of such true sons of the party will inspire many generation of Soviet people to the struggle for communism.

Yu. V. Andropov invariably used to stress that Leninism and Marxist-Leninist teaching in general are the inexhaustible source of the masses' revolutionary energy and creativity. On the basis of a system of fundamental ideas which has been tested many times in practice, on the basis of materialist dialectics, this teaching lives and develops, reflecting ever new phenomena, new developments in history, giving the fighters for communism perspicacity and confidence in the rightness of their cause, and cementing their will for victory. "Our party's strength," Comrade K. U. Chernenko points out, "lies in



its unity, its loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, and its ability to develop and channel the masses' creative activity and rally them ideologically and organizationally, guided by the tried Leninist principles and methods."

The inviolable continuity of the party's Leninist course is vitally important to the successful implementation of that course. This is no abstract concept, it is a real, living cause. The essence of continuity lies above all in moving forward without stopping. Moving forward, relying on all that has been achieved earlier, creatively enriching the experience accumulated, and focusing the collective thought and energy of communists, the working class, and all the Soviet people on unresolved tasks and key problems of the present and future. This was precisely the mood which permeated the work of the February and April 1984 CPSU Central Committee plenums.

And the fact that positive advances in the development of the national economy have now taken shape, major programs in the social sphere are being consistently implemented, all-around cooperation is developing among the socialist communist countries, and American imperialism's attempts to achieve military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries are being thwarted--all this is evidence that the course mapped out by the party is correct and enjoys the active unanimous support of Soviet people.

"We can and must," Comrade K. U. Chernenko said at the All-Army Conference of Komsomol Organization Secretaries, "make our society such that it accords in every respect with the highest, most exacting ideas of socialism. The ideas which were scientifically substantiated by Marx, Engels and Lenin. The ideas which inspire working people and the people's masses throughout the world to struggle for socialism. The ideas which have never allowed us to rest on our laurels or tolerate shortcomings and inadequacies."

That is how the party formulates the question now, thus demonstrating its revolutionary-critical attitude toward reality, its businesslike approach, and its determination, in Lenin's words, "not to be satisfied with the skill which our earlier experience has developed in us, but to go further without fail, to achieve more without fail, to progress without fail from easier tasks to more difficult ones" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, p 196).

Creatively developing and enriching Marxism-Leninism, the CPSU, headed by its tried and tested staff, the Leninist Central Committee, gives clear answers to the urgent problems of the present day. It is confidently leading the Soviet people along the path mapped out by Lenin.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/15



## NERUDA WAS, IS AND WILL BE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) pp 97-107

[Article by Volodia Teitelboim, Communist Party of Chile Central Committee Political Commission member, writer]

[Text] It was 20 years ago that Pablo Neruda and I decided to visit his birthplace--the small, dusty settlement of Parral, deep in the Chilean hinterland. This was a kind of pilgrimage to the source, a return to the beginning, an exploration of the place where the poet was born on 12 July 1904. The house turned out to be almost in ruins from an earthquake and the ravages of time. We roamed around the semicrumbled walls and the small stone-paved garden in Parral which, despite the wreckage and neglect, was covered with lush greenery, with the last grapes of the season hanging on the autumn vines. Neruda recalled his mother, whom he both knew and did not know, for she died when he was a month old. Later on, in the village, he was told about her, a sickly schoolteacher, a woman of poor health but strong spirit, and a great lover of books and poetry.

Eighty years have passed since the year of her death and his birth, and the life which a mother on the threshold of death gave to Neruda proved to be amazingly bright and fruitful in terms of 20th century Latin American poetry.

For more than 50 years he wrote poetry. Neruda is an eternally living classic who rose to the peak of the literary volcano of our continent.

What is the amazing secret of the unfading freshness of his work? Probably that, as a poet, he nurtured his talent with the juices of life and human history. It would be no exaggeration to say that his poetry knows no limits. It is as broad as our planet. It covers the entire world and draws its strength from the soil, maturing on social grounds with an energy worthy of admiration. Therefore, there is nothing amazing in the fact that in the course of such an enrichment the poet acceded forever to the ideas of communism.

I remember perfectly the morning of 8 July 1945, when Pablo Neruda was presented with his card as member of the Communist Party of Chile.

In truth, he had become a communist long before that. It would be difficult to determine with mathematical accuracy precisely when. The processes of spiritual maturing cannot be timed. However, ever since adolescence, many years before his attraction for the communist movement was crowned by official membership, he had marched hand in hand with the communists.

Apparently Neruda consciously resolved to become a full-fledged communist in Spain, in 1936, when the Civil War broke out in that country and the fascists executed his close friend, the great poet Federico Garcia Lorca. Neruda flatly resigned as Chilean consul in Madrid, openly took the side of the republic and began to publish his passionate poems which later became the book "Spain in the Heart." It was since then that he actually took the position of an active militant revolutionary.

Neruda returned to Chile on 10 October 1937 by sea and immediately established contacts with his new comrades and plunged into tempestuous activities. The dynamism, which was always inherent in his restless nature, reflected his spiritual power--organized and organizing--although all of us frequently heard Neruda unjustifiably complain of his own "slackness" and "laziness."

Twenty years previously, in Temuco, when Neruda was just beginning to write poetry, the first underground rumblings of the future volcanic eruption which covered bourgeois philistinism with dust, could already be felt. He publicly accused those "rich in money and poor in spirit" and expressed his indignation at the exploitation of man by man and the imperfect social system, although ideologically his works were still unclear and anarchic.

Between 1921 and 1924, after Neruda had moved from Temuco to Santiago and enrolled in the French department of the Pedagogical Institute at Santiago University, as a young but already known poet, he plunged headlong into the whirling student life. He began to contribute to the organ of the Student Federation--the journal CLARIDAD ("Clarity"), which was printed by the press on Tenderini Street, where the newspaper of the Chilean Workers Federation was also printed. Luis Emilio Recabarren, the founder of the Chilean Communist Party, who was very interested in establishing close contacts between the labor movement and the democratic university youth, frequently looked in. Recabarren, a person who had "rallied the lonely," subsequently assumed a firm leading place in Neruda's life and poetry. In his brief encounters Neruda began to conceive of the character of a people's hero with his feet on the ground, something which had always been the main focus of his poetry.

The enemies of democracy and progress were doing everything possible to make Neruda leave the ranks of the communist party. Repeated provocative efforts were made but he was always able to rebuff them and to answer them bluntly and even sharply. I remember how at one of his poetry readings at the Baquedano Theater in Santiago, on 16 June 1958, he said firmly: "I shall remain a communist for life." He kept his word.

I already pointed out that Neruda had felt close to the communists long before joining the party and that he had been interested in political and social problems since early youth. This can be noted in his first adolescent essays which were posthumously published in the anthology "Invisible River." They

reveal clearly and impassionately a rebellious spirit and a rejection of the society around him, which he considered unfair and deformed. In his poem "Nothing Special," every line of which is a criticism, he openly mocks the empty rhetoric of vague sacred and pseudopatriotic concepts: "A race of heroes; blood red copiu;<sup>1</sup> impassable selva...." In his "Interpretation of the City," Neruda describes the worker's labor as follows: "Dark, heavy, murderous.... The hands drop and then turn again like the paddles of an old mill.... Meanwhile, you do not even know that you are being exploited....," the poet says, in an effort to awaken the awareness of the reader. "The newspapers you skim through in the streetcar describe this as order, law and homeland-paradise. We name it exploitation, capital, fraud." This "we," expressed in a youthful age, is quite telling. The poem sounds almost like a pamphlet but is not a pamphlet at all. However, every word hits directly at the target. From a youthful age Neruda expressed himself bluntly and openly.

He was 16 years old when he came to study in Santiago. He frequently wrote the editorials for CLARIDAD, published in the section "Today's Poster," which usually carried articles of a revolutionary, militant nature. On 22 January 1921 a new name or, rather, a pseudonym--Pablo Neruda<sup>2</sup>--appeared in the journal for the first time, as the author of six poems which subsequently were included in the anthology "Twilight." Neruda had already contributed to the journal while still in Temuco and in 1920 had been elected president of the "Literary Atheneum" Society. His innate writer's talent had acquired a profession. In CLARIDAD alone, Neruda published 108 of his works under the same pseudonym, which subsequently became world-known, or under other names such as Sashka and Lorenzo Rivas. His poetry had a powerful, gushing force and his beautiful words could be heard virtually everywhere. At that time he contributed to many publications and publishing houses, such as ATHENEA, ANDANIOS, ABANICO, PANORAMA, EDUCACION and SIG-SAG, and to literary addenda to the newspapers MERCURIO and NACION. He edited the journal CABALLO DE BASTOS ("Beast of Burden"). After CLARIDAD, however, during his youth he worked most fruitfully for the journal JUVENTUD ("Youth").

CLARIDAD was the first Chilean periodical to support the progressive movement for a university reform (it was founded in 1918 in the Argentine city of Cordoba), which exposed the faults of a backward feudal society. The journal openly spoke out against the chauvinistic hysteria which threatened to lead the country into bloody slaughter and war with neighboring Peru; it opposed the so-called "Don Ladislao's slaughter"--a dangerous aggressive adventure planned by the oligarchy to counter the struggle for peace of the workers, students and intelligentsia.

In CLARIDAD the young Neruda encountered new trends of social thinking: the so-called descending and ascending. The former strived toward anarcho-sindicalist concepts while the latter promoted the ideals of communism. The supporters of the latter did not conceal their admiration for the October Revolution. They revered Recabarren, the leader of the Chilean communists. To Neruda Recabarren was a model of the type of people who, as Jorge Manrique used to say, take life in their own hands and draw to themselves all hearts. The workers and the students had the same enemy. The Student Federation had already been attacked by hooligans from the "Golden Youth" and rampaging

officers who wanted to teach a lesson to those who "sold Peru for gold," subsequently changed to the mythical "Moscow gold."

Neruda turned 22. "I am disgusted by the bourgeois...", was the expression he had used 10 years earlier in his poem "High School." Yes, Neruda had never been indifferent to social problems. Understandably, he was not born a communist. However, in the language of philosophy, he had always and invariably been a materialist.

A 5-year trip to the Orient--Burma, Ceylon, India and Indonesia--did not lead him into the arms of religion or metaphysics. He never believed the prophecies of the "gurus" and the sanctimonious beggars. On the contrary, he was interested in the movement for independence and against British and Dutch colonialism. In those countries his poetry reached even greater intimate depths and his political activities became increasingly leftist.

In the Orient, where he found himself totally alone, he firmed up his ideas and enriched his knowledge. "Day after day I am hitting the books...", he wrote to Argentine Hector Eandi, who was in Vellavatta, from Ceylon, on 27 February 1930. These were years of maturing and developing a personality, a time of discovery of new literatures and a passionate creativity and arguments with himself.

Neruda returned to Chile in 1932 quite changed. Physically he had matured. Poetically, he had strengthened and drawn away from his first beautiful love poems. He published his first collection of poems "Address, the Earth" (1925-1931) which reflected major changes and proved that he had firmly abandoned the topics of "Twenty Love Poems..." and "The Enthusiastic Slinger." This departure was also confirmed by his poem "The Effort of the Infinite Man," which, in his view, although not understood, represented to him the burning of the ships. It is true that the first anthology "Address, the Earth," which reflected Neruda's spiritual searches, was still part of the preceding age, of what was almost a different world. Let us not be mistaken here: in this book as well it is essentially a question of Neruda's inner world, of a shifting and changing world. It was a period of apparent political idleness. Let us underscore the word "apparent," for his social concerns and sadness had become buried deep within his heart, waiting to emerge tempestuously.

This tranquil life did not last long. When Neruda, who was Chilean consul in Buenos Aires, became consul in Barcelona, in 1934, he did not as yet suspect his future confrontation with politics in its most dramatic aspect. After he was appointed consul in Madrid, however, in February 1935, he already knew that he was entering a mine field. The suppression of freedom in Asturia filled Spain with heavy foreboding.

During the final 2 years of the existence of the republic, Neruda was surrounded by noted Spanish poets, who saw in him a brother and teacher. He himself became better familiar with the Spanish classics and, above all, with his idols Quevedo, Gongora and Conde de Villamediano. He was editor of the poetry journal CABALLO VERDE ("The Green Horse").



Federico Garcia Lorca used to say, I believe it was in 1934, that Latin America was sending to his homeland poets of varying powers of inspiration, talent and skill. The brilliant Andalusian classified them into singers of the tropical selva, the plains and the mountains. All of them, in his view, combined their different rhythms and tonality to enrich the same Spanish language. However, he distinguished in the works of many of them borrowed notes and the influence of Spain and, even more so, of France. The author of the "Gypsy Romancero" did not value poets who lacked what he described as the voice of America. To Garcia Lorca, this "voice" was a sign of recognition in classifying them into "major" and "minor." He felt that the former properly described the Latin American essence which, to him, was something huge, indomitable and fierce yet strange, close in spirit to the Spanish classics. He could feel this romantic luminescence through the fictitious French fog in the creativity of the great poet Ruben Dario and the Uruguayan H. Herrera y Reyssig, whose beautiful poetry he valued highly.

However, it was Pablo Neruda who was considered by Garcia Lorca as the true envoy of Latin America. In his view, Neruda was able to describe in an incomparable fashion the passion, tenderness and sincere simplicity of his land. He advised the Spaniards to listen more carefully to the Chilean poet and to try to learn something from him.

The day 18 July 1936 changed life in Spain as well as Neruda's. The Franco mutiny maimed the life of this country of the Pyrenees, which decisively influenced the Chilean poet's work and political activities. Some of Neruda's biography is closely tied to the Spanish Civil War and the death of his comrade and fellow writer Federico Garcia Lorca. He answered the assassins by casting in metal poetry and politics in his book "Spain in the Heart," which became part of the third anthology of "Address, the Earth." Another major poet of the Spanish republic, a farmer who fought on the front and who died on 28 March 1943 in the prison hospital in Alicante, said at his trial that Neruda "shook up Francoism." However, Neruda wanted to shake up heaven and earth to save this poet. In his "Universal Song" he recalls Miguel Hernandez, "ruined in the courts of Spain" and, furthermore, dedicated to him three poems in the book "Vineyards and Wind," naming him the "Tortured Shepherd."

In Spain Neruda saw with his own eyes and became closely familiar with the activities of the communists and the international brigades and realized the selfless aid given by the Soviet Union. This period brought him considerably closer to the communist party. Although he joined its ranks 10 years later, I repeat, he began to share communist ideas much earlier and to consider the communists his true comrades.

The Arturo Alessandri government recalled Neruda from Spain in 1937 because of his open sympathy for the republic. At that point, together with the famous Peruvian communist poet Cesar Vallejo, he founded in Paris the Latin American Group for Aid to Spain. He participated--for Neruda had the ability to rally efforts and unite people--in preparations for the second International Writers' Congress, which was held during the war in Madrid and Valencia. The congress was attended by leading writers from different countries, including Hemingway, Malraux, Aragon, Erenburg and others. The congress' resolutions recommended that associations in defense of culture be created everywhere.

It was with such a mission, among others, that Neruda returned to Chile in October 1937. Back home, he became a warrior, who knew no rest until he had set up the Alliance of the Antifascist Intelligentsia at the University of Chile on the symbolic date of 7 November. He became its first chairman. Fascism was the enemy of culture and this alliance was joined by the best members of the national intelligentsia, who built a wide block to stop fascism. Branches of the alliance appeared throughout the country, which was quite revealing. The poet was able to become the leader and organizer of his colleagues. However, the author had to find a way to express the expectations of his people. Soon afterwards Neruda raised high the people's flag. He founded the journal AURORA DE CHILE ("The Dawn of Chile"), deliberately naming his journal after a journal which had once promoted the independence of the homeland from the colonizers. Whereas the editor of the first journal was Frayle de la Buena Muerte,<sup>3</sup> the second AURORA DE CHILE was taken over by a poet who loved life more than anything else. Nevertheless, in the very first issue he had to write about death: the title of his article was "Cesar Vallejo Is Dead."

However, this did not end Neruda's concern for Spain. He was concerned with the fate of republicans who had sought refuge in France after the defeat and found themselves in concentration camps. They were threatened with the danger of being sent to fascist jails. Hitler and Petain walked hand in hand. The death of the great and noble Antonio Machado in Cuaiure triggered a sudden violent concern in his heart. Those still alive had to be saved, and he went to their aid with the support of the Communist Party of Chile and all antifascists. The new government elected by the Popular Front, headed by President Aguirre Serda, assigned in March 1939 to Neruda the mission to save the Spanish republicans and appointed him consul with special plenipotentiary powers.

Neruda had a strong and willful nature, whose words matched his deeds; if he set himself a goal he became simply obsessed. That is why he was able to solve tremendous problems in poetry and successfully to complete the very difficult project of bringing into the Chilean port of Valparaíso 3,000 Spanish emigres aboard the legendary "Winnipeg." Before that, however, a mass of obstacles had to be surmounted. Neruda could have lost his consular privileges at any moment. Many were those who believed that this rescue ship would never sail for Chile. Neruda did not give up. Despite great hardships, he thought not of himself but of the fate of thousands of refugees. Finally, the ship sailed off. It was almost the last ship to leave the shores of Europe before the outbreak of World War II. The "Winnipeg" operation was a test of Neruda's ability to engage in active efforts and struggle, a test which he passed with honor.

After his Spanish experience, Neruda's perception of life became even sharper. He looked critically at Europe, which had been unable to put an end to fascism and war; he began to look at his own Latin America with different eyes. He did not yield to nihilism and disappointment. He did not surrender but, conversely, he made his poetry sound like a bright torch illuminating the entire wretchedness of human existence and the poverty of the Latin American peoples and pointed out the solution which the poet himself saw in socialism.

This was confirmed by the fact that Neruda joined the Communist Party of Chile.

Unlike many other members of the intelligentsia and his contemporaries, Neruda did not accept the tragedy of the "great devastation" which fascism and war inflicted on the planet as a crisis of the human mind. He did not plunge into nostalgic moaning over the irreversible past but openly exposed the economic and ideological expansion of imperialism which had brought about a global conflagration. At the time of the raging of the Nazi vandals, who had invaded the Soviet Union with the intention of wiping socialism as a system off the face of the earth, unhesitatingly Neruda dedicated his songs to Stalingrad, the symbol of his own attachment to what he considered the model of the future of all mankind:

And when my voice will be no longer heard  
Drop on my grave a fragment of your shell  
And over it, an ear,  
A bloody ear from Stalingrad's grainfield.

And this will be a monument to the poet,  
Who needs no other prize:  
Although it was not I who hammered out your victory,  
I honed the sharpness of the blade  
Of this steel song to Stalingrad.<sup>4</sup>

"The world has changed and so have we with it, and so has my poetry," Neruda said as early as 1939. Soon afterwards he was appointed consul general of Chile to Mexico. Let us point out that politics never dulled his creative imagination and richest fantasy. He believed in the miracle of poetry. Neruda settled in an old house where the poet Ramon Lopez Velarde had lived 23 years earlier. It was there that he worked like a prisoner, like someone sentenced to...immortality. He toiled in the fields of poetry and politics.

The invasion of Soviet territory by the Hitlerite hordes affected him to the bottom of his soul and his "Songs of Love for Stalingrad" appeared not only in the press but in leaflets on house walls. "He is undermining Mexican neutrality," the enemy raged. Attempts were made on the poet's life and he received a head wound. He personally experienced the rage and impudence of fascism. However, Neruda was fearless.

He and I worked together in 1937 after his return from Spain. He returned to Chile in 1943, at the peak of the war. During that time he became a true son and representative of his people, both within himself and publicly. We set up a committee for his election to the senate from Tarapaca and Antofagasta provinces. Neruda's candidacy was supported by the communist party although he was not yet a member. His name appeared on the same list as that of our party's chairman Elias Laferte. Both were elected by majority vote in March 1945. Four months later, in the crowded Caupolican Theater, Pablo Neruda was presented with the card of member of the Communist Party of Chile, first among other members of the progressive Chilean intelligentsia.



Neruda's political activities, as I pointed out, did not limit his creative activities in the least. He wrote his poem "Machu Picchu Peak" at the beginning of 1943. His party membership did not narrow the scope of his poetry in the least. As always, he felt free. He wrote what he wanted and about anything. He expressed his understanding and reverence of the classical poets: "...In poetry I love the firmness, elegance and strictness of the columns made of marble and platinum, the age-old pillars of universal culture: Gongoro and Camoenca, Quevedo and Dante Alighieri. Culture, however, cannot be merely a personal possession or the sterile furniture of a castle. The people love words, they seek them as their battle flag, as their consolation in times of sadness. Words can come from us as well and seek the people...." These short lines express his feelings and thoughts with poetic sharpness.

The fact that political opportunism, of which he was sometimes accused by literary and other foes, was alien to Neruda, he proved through his activities during the cold war, when he opposed the oppressive regime of Gonzalez Videla. Together with his Argentine friend Faustino Jorge, he and I lived in his home "Los Gindos," at the time he wrote his "Friendly Letter to Millions of People," which was published in the newspaper NACIONAL in Caracas, on 27 November 1947. The president-chameleon and his pack of hounds fiercely attacked the poet. They even tried to set his house on fire. Neruda did not remain silent but counterattacked. Let us recall his widely known polemical speech delivered on 6 January 1948, when using the title of Zola's pamphlet on the Dreyfuss affair, delivered his "I Accuse" speech in the senate, in which, with no embellishments whatsoever, he sharply accused the president of betraying the people. The scale of the retaliatory repressive measures is confirmed by the huge page-wide headline in the 5 February issue of the newspaper IMPARCIAL: "Nationwide Search for Neruda."

He went underground, frequently changing location at night, during the "crystal hours" as we read in one of his poems. His watch also changed. While investigators were following his tracks, in his shelter the poet completed his major work initially entitled "General Song of Chile" but then changed to the simpler and most general title of "General Song," for it was dedicated to all of Latin America. It was his Poem of the New World. Occasionally, when they were able to shake the police, some of Neruda's friends would visit him in his secret shelter. The Spanish writer Corpus Barga published in the 3 October 1948 issue of the Mexican newspaper NACIONAL the story "Poet in Hiding" in which he described his visit to Neruda. Neruda was in hiding but was also active. When the "General Song," an epic consisting of 342 poems, was completed (for concealment purposes the manuscript was entitled "Laughter and Tears," by Benigno Espinoza), by decision of the party the poet secretly left Chile in February 1949.

Neruda actively participated in the peace movement. He traveled tirelessly even while working on his poetry every single day. Neruda visited the Soviet Union for the first time in 1949. This great poet, who had exposed Hitlerite fascism, finally saw with his own eyes socialism being built, a socialism which was transforming man and turning the Soviet people into the largest reading public in the world, into a passionate lover of poetry. Everyone knows that he dedicated his heart forever to the Soviet Union and the Soviet people: "I fell in love with the Soviet land the moment I laid eyes on it,



and understood that it was not only teaching a lesson in morality in all areas of manifestation of human life and made it possible to compare possibilities and set an example of active efforts and just distribution but, as it seemed to me, a great flight will take off from these steppes with their amazing natural purity. All mankind knows that it is there that a gigantic truth is being created and the world is waiting for what the future will show with great interest. Some live with fear. Others simply live and others again believe that they can already see the future."<sup>5</sup> Neruda was enthusiastically welcomed back in Chile after a 3-year absence. On 12 August 1952 he addressed a large meeting in Bulnes Square. About himself he said clearly and briefly: "I am a Chilean from our South." In one of its November issues VISTASO published his deepfelt article of his new meeting with the homeland--"The Aroma of Return."

Soon afterwards Neruda participated in a noteworthy event: the Congress of Latin American Cultural Workers, which took place in Santiago from 29 February to 2 March 1953. It was there that he delivered his famous speech "To the World Through Poetry." Possibly, after Marti there has been no Latin American writer whose speeches have been so meaningfully eloquent: the speaker threw a bridge from the sources of poetry and history to the current vital problems and to the solution of the practical problems the people face. Somewhat later his anthology "Poetry and Politics" was published. To Neruda, both concepts were not only compatible but components of a single entity.

This man who had enriched Latin American literature with a treasury of great variety in terms of genre and nature, lived another 20 years after these events.

He struggled for his people, his country and the cause of peace and socialism to the last day of his life. He never surrendered his position, as he had promised 30 years previously. As the target of life, in the face of death he fired his last shots, the echo of which can still be heard, shots at fascism which had killed innumerable Chileans during the last 2 weeks of his life.

On that sad day, 23 September 1973, this true poet died like a true communist, still full of creative strength, as confirmed by his nine posthumously published books.

Nine days before his death and 72 hours after the fascist coup d'etat in Chile, Neruda began the final chapter of his memoirs "I Admit: I Lived." In it he condemned the shameful bandit putsch. Once again he spoke of loyalty to his party. "I joined the party many years ago...I am glad to have done so.... The communists are a good family. They have weatherbeaten skin and a sensitive heart.... Now the people will be misled more than anyone else... Allende was killed for nationalizing the copper...."

Whereas Balzac entitled his novels "The Human Comedy," Neruda wrote his Human Poetry, his Humane Poetry, his amazing Humaneness, although he never named it such.

The sheer number of his poems, variety of topics, abundance of thoughts, characters, travels, close contacts with people, active participation in the

struggle, creative restlessness, the passion and vitality of his works, his entire tempestuous and outstanding biography, his thousand and one themes played on the stage of the universal writers, and the greatness of the spirit with which he countered the hard days and years, including his illness, his creative stoicism with which he welcomed it and his ability to respond to the most terrible challenges of fate were all features which characterized Neruda as a poet with full spiritual dedication, whose works are not a chaotic pile of compositions but the poetic history of a great life. It was thus that one of the most gigantic talents on our continent was manifested and developed. Everything he wrote--small or big--has a deep meaning.

Participation in social battles did not weaken Neruda's creative spirit. On the contrary, it strengthened it like a beneficial rain falling on fertile soil, not creating words for their own sake but yielding fruits and noble wines for the good of the people. Neruda drew his inspiration from the entire world surrounding him, and the world made his inspired works its own.

When the party nominated Neruda for president at the 1969 elections, in his first speech in the electoral campaign he said: "I have never divided my life between poetry and politics. My thoughts and actions express what I am and I, in my essence, represent the people of my homeland. I am a Chilean who is experiencing in this century all the troubles and difficulties of our lives and who shares all the difficulties and joys of my people. I come from a family of working people who did not shy away from hard work in the southern end of the country. I have never joined the party of the haves and have always felt that my vocation and my task is to serve the people of Chile through my actions and my views. I have lived and I live by singing and defending the cause."

This passionate poet of love, who broke down the obsolete language of poetry and blazed new paths in it, loved with equal passion daily life and reveled in daily battles.

The poet's love of life, spirituality and creativity formed such a colorful and harmonious blend that poetry cannot be considered a selection of idyllic pastorals. He looked into the depth of things and political events. It was thus that he lived and died, with the belief that such a vision of the world should be inherent not only in man alone but in mankind at large. He tolerated no indifference. He was a poet-polemicist who plunged into the thick of the world's battles. His life's meaning was his unabated desire for and need to help to humanize man, his interest in the knowledge of people and the applications of his discoveries in poetry. His life was full of daring and happiness. He lived it frenziedly. His death was not easy, for as he was dying he was not alone, the country of which he was a part was also dying.

Neruda remains alive not only in Chile. He lives in all of Latin America, the Soviet Union, and the socialist countries. In the East books with his poetry, which is being profoundly studied and popularly interpreted, continue to be published. This is understandable, for a travel around Neruda's works always leads to findings. A return to his works allows us to see many unstudied areas and to study the various aspects of the work of this alchemist of the language. Neruda was a poet of the bad weather which he emotionally

and scrupulously described like the ancient seamen in their logbooks, for bad weather was his permanent companion, he had become used to it since childhood, living in a city not very far from the South Pole, and hard trials had become part of his life and a permanent object of thoughts and recollections. At the same time, Neruda burst out of his native overcast land on the fiery horse of his poetry to discover the world. This horse carried him not on the imaginary wings of children. The horseman did not leave dry land. He saw the miracles of nature and the sadness of people first in his own homeland and, beyond it, in the Orient, where colonialism still ruled.

Later, he was the only navigator aboard the ship of poetry who could see a light in the fog, the beacon of a new life, and who dedicated his songs to the Soviet Union. "Great New World" is his hymn of the rebirth of a huge part of the globe under the banner of socialism. This poet, who asked for peaceful rosy dawns, further creativity, slumbering cities, sharing, peace on the dead and the living and peace on land and water, this poet has no peace in his own grave. Many of Neruda's admirers were arrested by Pinochet's police at his grave in Santiago's main cemetery. Their crime was to remember the poet's birthday. What were they charged with? They were charged with violating the "Law on Order the Internal Security of the State."

This is no isolated case. Whenever the people go to the cemetery, on 12 July and 23 September, to honor the memory of a man who has entered the history of Chile and the Latin American continent and all Spanish literature, the police are there not in the least to honor the splendor of his poetry.

This is worth thinking about. In life, Neruda was someone attached to the cause of his people, exposing all exploitation and foreign intervention, from the Conquistadores to Washington's imperialists. He spoke out in defense of his continent, loudly and clearly, and the force of his call does not dull the elegance of his poetry.

As we know, in the final week of his life, several days after the putsch, Neruda dictated for inclusion in his "Memoirs" a merciless indictment of Pinochet and his inspirers and stooges. This was a quick sentence but time proved Neruda right. The crimes and raids of the neo-Fascists on his homeland were legalized and revealed to the world a regime aimed at perpetuating the exploitation and poverty of underdeveloped countries, attacking with insane rage those who opposed the arms race. For that reason, living or dead, Neruda will remain to such a machine a permanent violator of the Law on the Internal Security of the State." He always violated the deadly laws of fascism and did so even in the course of his funeral, which took place 2 weeks after the coup d'etat prepared in Washington, when the blood of thousands of people poured in Chile like a river. A large group of heroes, which included many of his close comrades, organized on that same day, 25 September 1973, the first popular demonstration against the fascist regime: the people marked it by loudly singing the Internationale, under the muzzles of police submachine guns. The people risked their lives to take him properly to his final rest, under this anthem, as a man who had died a communist and who, to his last breath, had lived with the struggle and pains of his people and the hopes for a better future. In Stockholm, when he received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1971, Neruda did not resort to simplistic formulas. On the contrary, he most

loudly proclaimed his most active political stance: "In thinking about all aspects of the so-called "duty of the poets, whether perspicacious or wrong, I decided that my activities also should assume their specific modest place in society and life. I made this decision, realizing how glory can crumble, how a lonely victory or an overwhelming failure can take place. I realized, in entering the American battlefield, that my purpose was to blend with the infinite power of the organized people, to blend my soul and my blood with their aspirations and their hopes, for it is only this which can bring the changes which both writers and peoples need...."

The communist party opened to Neruda the broadest possible horizons and taught him the creative lesson of life and human assertion.

From the very depth of his soul and his mind, as a reflection of its perception of the world, an impressive poem was born, which also reflects the most profound feelings of many people of the 20th century: "My Party:"

You gave me brotherhood with others--  
With those whom I do not know.  
You gave me the strength of all the living.  
You gave me back my homeland, as though I was reborn.  
You gave me freedom--alone I could not have it.

You taught me to fan goodness, like fire.  
You gave me a directness without which no growth is possible.  
You taught me the meaning of unity  
And difference in people.

You proved to me that the pain of one  
Dies in the victory of all.  
You taught me to learn from the people  
And live its life.  
You led me to the truth, to stand on it  
Like on a rock.  
You made me be the foe of hatred  
and an obstruction to the savagery of the bad.  
You let me see the world's entire clarity  
And that joy was possible.  
You made me permanent: with you I will not die.<sup>6</sup>

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Flowers common in the northern part of Chile.
2. The poet's real name was Neftali Ricardo Reyes Basoalto.
3. Literal translation: Brother Good Death.
4. From "New Song of Love for Stalingrad." P. Neruda, "Sobr. Soch." [Collected Works], 4 volumes. Volume 1, Moscow, 1978, p 155 (translated by S. Goncharenko.



5. Pablo Neruda: "Confieso que he Vivido. Memorias" [I Admit: I Lived. Recollections]. Ed. Losada, Buenos Aires, 1974, pp 368, 394 (translated by M. Bylinkina).
6. P. Neruda, "Sobr. Soch.," Volume 3, p 393 (translated by O. Savich).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Kommunist". "Pravda", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/15

## OUTER SPACE IS NO PLACE FOR MILITARY ADVENTURES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) pp 108-113

[Article by Col M. Rebrov, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA editorial collegium member]

[Text] Outer space.... The age of its development began on that memorable day of 4 October 1957, when the Soviet Union launched the first artificial earth satellite, thus offering to the people on earth the gift of a small man-made "moon." More than one-quarter of a century has passed since. During that time, man's creative genius and efforts have launched into near space orbit thousands of satellites, reached the moon and sent automatic laboratories to distant planets. More than 140 earth envoys have visited outer space. The first among them was our compatriot, party member Yuriy Gagarin. His flight, which took place on 12 April 1961, marked the greatest victory of mankind over the forces of nature. Entire crews followed Gagarin's path in space and man dared to emerge from the ship into open space.

On the day Gagarin started, the communist party and the Soviet government appealed to all people on earth, to all progressive mankind to turn near space into an arena of scientific and technical cooperation in the interests of peace and progress through joint efforts. "We consider that the victory in the conquest of space," the document stated, "is not only an accomplishment of our people but of all mankind. We happily put them in the service of all nations, for the sake of the progress, happiness and well-being of all people on earth. We put our accomplishments and discoveries not in the service of war but of peace and the security of the peoples."

Initially space flying machines were launched for experimental purposes, after which a turn was taken toward the increasingly extensive use of outer space technology for practical needs on earth. Automated satellites, sounding rockets, interplanetary laboratories, manned ships and orbital stations taught mankind many new things about earth and space around it. They told of the composition, density and temperature of the atmosphere at varying altitudes, the intensiveness of space rays, solar wind, magnetic fields and radiation belts. Space instruments even entered the old debate on the "shape" of our planet, proving that the earth was neither round nor elliptical but had its own specific--geoidal--shape.

Outer space technology enabled the people to find new solutions to problems of communications, navigation, geodesy and cartography, to make long-term weather forecasts, to control the environment, to study natural resources and to compute the coordinates of ships and airplanes in difficulty.... Space technology helped astronomers to "see" the other side of the moon and obtain pictures of Venus and Mars, to gather most interesting information about the sun and to travel to Jupiter and Saturn.

The prophetic words of K. E. Tsiolkovskiy, the great man from Kaluga, are beginning to be realized. He believed that outer space will make mankind the gift of "mountains of bread and infinite power." Another valuable thought expressed by this wise and perspicacious person was the following: "...Mankind will acquire a universal ocean given to it as though precisely for turning the people into a single entity, a single family...."

The conquest of outer space, the penetration within its depth and the use of its unique "features," as well as the development of space technology itself, are an entirely new and quite specific area of human activities. On the one hand, mankind acquires tremendous opportunities for progress; on the other, such activities could bring incalculable difficulties to the world. All depends on the way such accomplishments will be used, for there is no essential difference between rockets used for peaceful scientific research in outer space and missiles used for military purposes.

Two conflicting approaches to the use of outer space exist today. From the very beginning of the development of outer space, the Soviet Union has systematically and persistently struggled for giving it an exclusively peaceful and humane nature. Our country initiated extensive international cooperation in the study of outer space for the good of all mankind. The joint multinational experiments based on the Interkosmos program were an outstanding example of the fruitfulness of the combined efforts of different countries in unraveling the secrets of nature. Cosmonauts from the socialist countries and representatives of France and India worked on board the Salyut-6 and Salyut-7 scientific stations.

At the same time, from the very beginning of the space age, our country has persistently worked for adopting international agreements which would reliably block plans for the utilization of space technology for military purposes and extending the arms race to near space. As early as 1958, i.e., almost immediately after the appearance of the first artificial earth satellite, the Soviet government suggested to the United Nations General Assembly to consider the question of banning the use of outer space for military purposes.

Subsequently, on the initiative and with the active cooperation of the USSR, a number of important international agreements were drafted and concluded. The multilateral treaty on banning nuclear weapons tests in the three media, including outer space, was enacted in 1963. A treaty on the principles governing the activities of individual countries in the study and utilization of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, was initialed in 1967. These agreements, which were joined in variety of ways by the majority of countries on earth, laid a good beginning for new efforts to prevent the militarization of outer space.

In 1981 the Soviet government submitted for consideration by the UN General Assembly a draft treaty on banning the deployment in outer space of all weapons. It was supported by the majority of UN member countries. Last year the Soviet Union launched another important initiative and submitted for discussion at the 28th UN General Assembly session the question "On Concluding a Treaty Banning the Use of Force in Outer Space and from Outer Space to Earth." This proposal as well was approved by the overwhelming majority of the participants. Moscow is "actively urging control over armaments. There is a chance, possibly the last, to prevent the shifting of the arms race to outer space," THE NEW YORK TIMES acknowledged. This is true, for the conclusion of such a treaty would protect the countries on earth from the hostile use of outer space technology as a striking weapon as well as space projects from the use of force against them.

The Soviet proposal calls for a total ban on testing and deploying in outer space space-based weapons, abandoning tests of already developed and banning the creation of new and eliminating existing antisatellite systems. In an effort to assist in finding a mutually acceptable solution to this problem as soon as possible, the USSR proclaimed a unilateral moratorium on being the first to launch antisatellite weapons in outer space. In other words, it proclaimed a unilateral moratorium on such launching for as long as other countries, including the United States, would abstain from deploying such weapons in outer space.

However, all the efforts of the Soviet Union in this area have met with the stubborn and fierce opposition of the United States and its main NATO partners, particularly of late. They oppose the adoption of new measures which would prevent the militarization of outer space. Naturally, this is no accident. This is not the first year that the aggressive U.S. militaristic circles have focused on the use of near space for their hegemonistic aspirations, considering it another theater of military operations, very promising from their viewpoint. The American military-industrial complex is longingly looking at outer space as a source of fabulous profits as a result of extending to it the arms race.

United States imperialism launched its outer space adventure soon after the Soviet Union launched the first artificial earth satellite. It was precisely then that the decision was made overseas to undertake the development of a space weapon (Project Saint). This went on. In experimenting with various weapons which could be used in outer space, the Pentagon insisted on appropriations of more and more billions of dollars and was not refused. During the past 20 years the United States has spent \$50 billion on outer space military programs.

This generosity shown by the power of the rich gave the developers of outer space technology new "risky hopes," as D. Endelman, a CBS correspondent described them. The long-term scientific research administration of the U.S. Department of Defense developed at full speed work on a number of joint projects which were given the name Triad. This Triad includes "Alpha" (a program for the creation of a high-power chemical laser), LODE--"Large Optical Demonstration Experiment" (a targeting system) and "Tolan Gold" (development



of a target detection system). This overall program for "Star War" preparations has a fourth item, code-named "Till Ruby." This applies to the development of a system of sensors which would allow space platforms to detect "enemy" launchings by the heat emanating from the missiles. The U.S. Congress has already approved additionally hundreds of millions of dollars for the implementation of these plans. Antisatellite weapons are being designed on a parallel basis across the ocean.

Such intensive efforts were not particularly publicized for a while. They were kept "under wraps." However, on 23 March 1983, hurling a cynical challenge to all mankind and grossly ignoring existing international agreements, U.S. President Reagan publicly declared in a television speech that the United States is undertaking preparations for combat operations in outer space and proclaimed the idea of establishing a huge antimissile defense system in near space. However hard the American President tried to conceal the true plans of the American military in his speeches, with unctuous declarations of the desire to "save mankind," "concern for future generations," "strategic stability" and "nuclear shield," the cat was out of the bag. In fact, this marked the beginning of the implementation of a large-scale strategic program aimed at developing a potential for waging nuclear war in and from outer space, as was confirmed with Directive No 119, which Reagan signed on 6 January 1984.

The new directive gives a green light to plans for the further militarization of outer space, drafted by a specially created committee headed by J. Fletcher, former director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Foreign observers have noted that even according to most conservative estimates the cost of such plans may reach \$20-27 billion. In particular, great hopes rest on outer space antimissiles systems, including orbital platforms with laser and beam weapons. It was announced that by 1994 more than one-third of all planned flights by the American Space Shuttle has been reserved by the Defense Department for planned experiments.

Using a hackneyed method, White House and Pentagon officials are trying to convince their compatriots, along with world public opinion, that these decisions by the administration are merely forced "responses" to the notorious "Soviet threat," for the USSR has allegedly "significantly outstripped" the United States in the development of antisatellite weapons. Furthermore, the American propaganda machine is actively trying to present such militaristic preparations made by Washington as strictly "defensive," stemming from the concept of "assured survival." It is claimed that the United States is merely seeking a means of paralyzing Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles before they reach American territory.

Statements such as the following are for consumption by the ignorant: "Laser guns will enable us to stop Soviet missiles on our end of their trajectory. A laser beam, impeccably aimed, can destroy a missile at a distance of several thousand miles. The concentrated heat of this beam will burn the external casing of the missile as a result of which it will self-destruct. This is entirely safe, for the garbage will either remain in outer space or will fall on the foul Russians." Such "revelations" were published in the magazine ROLLING STONE, in an article entitled "War and Outer Space."

The Reagan administration is not bothered by the fact that its plans for the military use of outer space are grossly violating extant international agreements the purpose of which is to block access to space for such weapons. This applies above all to the Soviet-American Treaty on Limiting Antimissile Defense Systems (1972) which bans the development, testing and deployment of antimissile defense systems or components, specifically those based in outer space, and the international Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Study and Utilization of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which stipulates that its signatories, including the United States, undertake not to put in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other types of mass destruction weapons.

The idea of a space "shield," which can allegedly protect America from attack, promoted by President Reagan, is not simply a subterfuge. His views on the "peaceable" nature of American outer space plans are dangerous because they are aimed at misleading public opinion and dulling the vigilance of the broad peace-loving public.

The true meaning of this plan is not to reduce the threat of war in the least. The space adventure strategists would like to guarantee for themselves the possibility of dealing a first strike with impunity and save themselves from the crushing retaliation of the Soviet Union. This is also the purpose of the development of antisatellite systems. The foreign press has cited a number of competent testimonials to this effect. Thus, John Pike, a member of the Federation of American Scientists, who is well-informed as to the way of thinking of the Pentagon's leadership, convincingly said that antisatellite weapons are a "key element in a first strike potential." "To the United States," asserts T. Keras, another American scientist, "the creation of antisatellite systems would be meaningless without plans for dealing a first strike and starting a nuclear war."

Many Washington officials are quite open in their statements. They admit that they consider outer space a potential theater of military operations. "Whoever is able to gain control of outer space--the main arena of future wars," Senator M. Wollup has said, "will be able to turn around the ratio of forces decisively. This would be the equivalent of establishing world domination." With military bluntness, Col Jack Lusma, the skipper of the Columbia Space Shuttle, expressed the hopes of those who are promoting this program in the Pentagon: "Outer space is the place from which the entire world can be kept in a state of fear."

The Pentagon strategists are feeling "squeezed" in the earth's longitudes and latitudes. The American Defense Department has set up numerous subunits on the military use of outer space. A special department for planning U.S. military policy in outer space is already operational; the creation of a "joint space command," which will combine the efforts of the Air Force, the Navy and the Army in the area of military operations in outer space, is being prepared. The creation of a "special outer space technological center" was announced recently. Its purpose will be to pay maximal attention to the latest technology with a view to the development of military-outer space systems. Lt Gen J. Abrahamson, who was appointed director of the program for

the development of an antisatellite defense system based on outer space, has acknowledged that "President Reagan's concept involves not only the United States and its allies but the neutral European countries as well." This proves that the scale of such dangerous adventurism has broadened.

That same ROLLING STONE magazine also reports that the idea of a "pulse" bomb, which could be based on satellites flying over Soviet territory, is being aired in some American circles. None other than D. Graham, a retired lieutenant general and former head of the DIA, gave details of the "High Border" Program, pointing out that it calls for establishing a network of 432 outer space satellites, each one of which will carry between 40 and 50 missiles for striking at Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles. All of this is directly related to the Pentagon's first strike strategy.

The plans for the development of a broad antimissile system are merely part of the extensive militaristic program of the present U.S. administration. Like the U.S. antisatellite plans, they are closely linked to the feverish increase in the number and improvement of strategic offensive weapons, such as the MX missile, the Trident-2, the Stealth bomber and the development of long-range Pershing-2 and cruise missiles based in all media around the borders of the Soviet Union. The Pentagon and those who inspire it are not pursuing defensive purposes in developing outer space weapons systems. They are urged on by that same maniacal idea of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and thoughts of global domination. By involving the world in a new round of the arms race, the United States and its allies are taking a riskypath, for space weapons are among the most dangerous factors in disturbing strategic stability. However, this adventuristic policy will not bring success to the imperialists across the ocean.

"The Soviet Union is a firm opponent of competition in any type of arms race, including outer space weapons," Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, said in his answer to the address by American scientists, who expressed their deep concern about the danger of extending the arms race to outer space. "It must be clear, at the same time, that in the face of threats from outer space, the Soviet Union will be forced to take steps reliably to ensure its safety. Hopes that a path may be laid to military superiority through outer space are based on illusions. However, those who make such plans are unwilling to abandon them, something which is fraught with extremely dangerous consequences. Preventing such a course of events before it is too late is the direct obligation of responsible statesmen, scientists and all those who are truly concerned with the future of mankind."

Clearly aware of the fact that shifting the arms race to near space would give it a qualitatively new and even more dangerous nature, would turn outer space into a source of constant mortal threat to all mankind and would have an extremely destabilizing influence on the entire international situation, the Soviet government is once again urgently appealing to political and social leaders of all countries to show proper responsibility and good will and to initiate, with no preconditions or stipulations, official talks with a view to reliably blocking all channels leading to the militarization of outer space. Outer space must not become a base for aggression and war!

In his answers to the questions asked by American journalist J. Kingsbury-Smith, Comrade K. U. Chernenko particularly emphasized that "an immediate agreement must be reached on such problems, before outer space weapons have been deployed and before a thrust in the outer space arms race, of unpredictable consequences, has taken place. Tomorrow may be too late."

Soviet proposals on preventing the militarization of outer space and therefore preserving the peaceful nature of space research, dictated by common sense and good will and based on the interests of all nations, are meeting with the understanding and support of the broad circles of the peace-loving public on the planet and by all those who care for scientific progress for the good of mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/15



## AMERICA IS NOT THE UNITED STATES ONLY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 [signed to press 18 Jun 84] pp 114-125

[Article by V. Bushuyev and B. Martynov]

[Text] In the 1980s relations between Latin American countries and the United States entered a period of drastic aggravation. Despite Washington's efforts to keep them under its military-political and economic control and to isolate them from the main trends in the world, these countries are defending their political autonomy and protecting their national sovereignty with increasing courage. Their international reputations have strengthened substantially in recent years and their role and significance in world politics and economics have increased. The struggle waged by the people's masses against the neocolonialist policy of American imperialism is becoming increasingly broader; the counteraction on the part of the governments and the public in the Latin American countries is becoming energized.

In our day virtually the entire system of U.S. imperialist rule in Latin America is in a state of crisis. It has affected the ideological and political base of inter-American relations--pan-Americanism--which concealed Washington's expansionistic course for many decades behind slogans of "continental solidarity" and "the common historical destiny" of the two Americas. Political and organizational foundations of such relations--the inter-American "mutual aid" treaty of 1947 (the "Rio de Janeiro Treaty") and the Organization of American States (OAS) found themselves threatened and revealed their complete ineffectiveness.

By taking the path of armed adventures and providing increasing financial and military support to the most reactionary oligarchic forces on the continent, the ruling circles of the United States are trying to turn back the development of the revolutionary liberation movement in Latin American countries and to impose upon them a type of dependence adapted to the new historical conditions. Particular efforts are being made to "bring order" in inter-American relations with a view to forcing the neighbors on the continent obediently to follow in the fairway of U.S. policy and to use them in global imperialist plans. Such a course, which conflicts with the national interests of the Latin American countries and the aspirations and expectations of their

peoples, inevitably leads to the further widening of the gap separating the United States from Latin America.

1

The victory of the Cuban revolution a quarter of a century ago became a historical landmark which marked a new stage in the struggle waged by the Latin American peoples against imperialism and for their "second liberation." Its example clearly proved that under the conditions of the changed ratio of forces in the world arena, even a small country considered by Washington as one of the most reliable within its orbit was able to free itself from imperialist slavery and take the path of radical social change. With the support of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist community and the solidarity of the global communist and worker movements, the Cuban people undertook to build socialism. Although quite substantially different from each other in terms of levels of socioeconomic development and extent of maturity of revolutionary forces, Cuba's victory and successes in building a new life contributed in all Latin American countries to energizing the struggle of the popular masses for a democratic, agrarian, anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist revolution.

The powerful upsurge of the liberation and anti-imperialist movement in Latin America forced Washington to look for new ways and means of implementing its policy of expansion and plunder in this part of the world. This gave birth to the doctrine of the "real organization" of Latin American society through evolution and superstructural bourgeois-reformist changes instead of revolution. In other words, it was a question of achieving an accelerated capitalist development in Latin American countries under the tireless control of their northern neighbor. In the case of nations on the continent unwilling to use the antirevolutionary "vaccine" of bourgeois reformism, the American politicians always kept ready their traditional "big stick." This stick has been repeatedly and actively used since the times of the brutal annexation by the United States of more than half of Mexico's territory in the middle of the 19th century and the expansion of American imperialism in Central America and the Caribbean by the turn of the 20th century. Washington has frequently resorted to it subsequently as well. Meanwhile, the supporters of the "firm course" greatly relied on the Latin American military with whose help they tried to ensure the unhindered continuation of the plunder by U.S. monopolies.

Lenin emphasized that "the bourgeoisie in all countries inevitably develops two systems of management and two means of struggle for its interests and for defending its rule, alternating between them or intertwining them in a variety of combinations. They are, first of all, the method of coercion and refusal to make any concessions to the labor movement, the method of supporting all the old and obsolete institutions, the method of irreconcilable rejection of reform.... The second method is that of 'liberalism,' of taking steps toward the development of political rights, reforms, concessions, and so on" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 20, p 67). It is precisely thus, by combining the stick with the carrot, and establishing either bourgeois reformist regimes, in which the weeds of social demagoguery blossomed tempestuously, or military dictatorships, which suppressed basic bourgeois

rights and freedoms, that the U.S monopoly circles operated in Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s.

Reality hit most violently the strategy of imperialism. Neither reformism nor violence justified the hopes of the American ruling circles and their local puppets or were able to stop the revolutionary liberation struggle of the peoples. The growth of capitalism with the continuing dependence on U.S. monopoly capital, although it had helped a number of countries to reach a relatively higher level of maturity of production forces, in the final account, as practical experience confirms, increased the overall development disproportion and led to an even greater aggravation of socioeconomic problems. In involving their Latin American neighbors into the system of the global capitalist economy and replacing their former and obsolete forms of dependence with more refined ones, the imperialists are trying to resolve a strategic problem of securing their rule by adapting themselves to contemporary historical conditions.

Such a development course leads, on the one hand, to the appearance of a modern industrial sector in some of the Latin American countries and accelerates their process of capital construction and development of a working class. On the other, however, the countries in the area assume an even heavier burden of dependence, which is increasing primarily in the financial and technological areas.

With the new control levers at their disposal, the multinational corporations and banks try to lower production costs and to circumvent antitrust legislation and environmental protection restrictions, which makes them interested in shifting some production units to Latin American countries (labor-, energy- and material-intensive or ecologically dangerous). This leads to new disproportion in the economy of those countries. Therefore, under the new circumstances an essentially neocolonialist development "model" is restored, which meets above all the requirements of American multinational corporations (MC). Its use bleeds the Latin American countries dry while at the same time, with the transfer of huge funds, substantially assists the functioning of the U.S. economy itself.

Over the past 4 years, as the report which was drafted by American banking experts show, as a result of capital exports the Latin American countries have been deprived of no less than \$100 billion. Their huge and steadily increasing indebtedness is a heavy burden they must bear. Such indebtedness increased by one-half between 1980 and 1982, from \$200 billion to \$300 billion. By the beginning of 1984 the foreign debt of Latin American countries had reached \$336 billion. The funds which they must divest from production utilization and domestic accumulation and use to pay their debts and the interest are increasing correspondingly. From \$2.4 billion in 1970, they rose to \$54 billion by 1980.

The problems of Latin America became particularly sharply delineated against the economic decline which spread throughout the capitalist world and as a result of protectionist foreign trade measures taken by the United States and the other developed capitalist countries. The countries on the continent are

also suffering tremendous losses in the billions of dollars from a drop in world prices of raw materials which traditionally dominate their exports.

Another circumstance is also very important. The type of economic development imposed upon it deprives the overwhelming majority of the Latin American population of the opportunity to benefit from the results of economic growth. Despite a certain increase in the growth of their national products, mass poverty and unemployment continue to increase on a broader scale rather than decline. The growing negative balance of payments leads to steady devaluations of national currencies and endless inflation which, in turn, triggers price increases and drops in purchasing power.

Currently more than 100 million people on that continent are suffering from malnutrition. The number of unemployed has reached 36 million and the level of inflation, which reduces to naught economic efforts and worsens the already calamitous living conditions of the working people, averaged 53 percent in 1983.

The incurable faults of capitalism, which has assumed a distorted shape in Latin America as a result of its dependent nature and intensified preservation of precapitalist vestiges in a number of countries, aggravate the crisis in socioeconomic structures. The possibility of eliminating it through partial superficial reforms acceptable to the ruling classes, as practical experience of recent decades proves, is nonexistent. This crisis, which has spread to all countries on the continent to one extent or another, despite major differences among them, is manifested in the sharp class confrontation which has become a structural component of the anti-imperialist revolutionary-democratic struggle.

"One of the basic features of imperialism," Lenin pointed out, "is precisely that it accelerates the development of capitalism in the most backward countries, thus widening and intensifying the struggle against national oppression" (op. cit., vol 30, p 132). This is quite apparent in Latin America today, where the process of capitalist modernizing, encouraged by the MC, and the reaching by several countries of an average level of capitalist development and the processes of capital monopolization and concentration in some of them are paralleled by the growing opposition of the people's masses, manifested in a great variety of ways and means of struggle against local and foreign oppressors. Another characteristic of the contemporary situation is the fact that the ruling circles of a number of countries on the continent are clashing with increasing frequency with U.S., Latin American and global strategy.

The accelerated and conflicting development of capitalism in Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Venezuela and Colombia resulted in a certain stratification within the capitalist class and contributed to the appearance of a significant bourgeois stratum interested in gaining freedom from the stifling tentacles of strangulating multinational monopoly octopuses and profit from interimperialist contradictions and find new sources of financing programs of industrial development and markets for their national industries. Throughout the 1970s economic and trade relations between Latin America and countries outside the Western hemisphere, including the socialist world, increased



significantly. In organizing and strengthening intraregional cooperation and cohesion, the countries on the continent are increasingly opposing U.S. pressure. As the journal BUSINESS WEEK, the spokesman for North American monopoly circles, sadly noted, two decades of accelerated development of capitalism in Latin America "diversified the ties between that area and the rest of the world and reduced its basic political dependence on the United States."

The aspiration of the local bourgeois strata, who are not directly tied to the MC, to assume in the international arena a position consistent with the increased economic importance and political significance of their country determined the upsurge of their foreign policy activities. Although the logic of the class struggle is what encourages the ruling circles in these countries to compromise with the United States, the aspiration to secure and protect their own economic interests is what predetermines their clash with imperialism, forcing them to demand equality in relations with Washington, to assert their own control over natural resources and to limit MC activities. Another largely contributing factor in this case is the increased pressure applied by the toiling masses, the proletariat above all. The Latin American countries have intensified their efforts to find a common platform for cooperation with developing Asian and African countries in the struggle for a new international economic order. Latin America has increased its representation in the nonaligned movement. In the United Nations, the countries on that continent are increasingly refusing to follow Washington's lead. The struggle for strengthening their political autonomy and achieving economic independence has become their main development trend today.

During the period of detente the profound contradictions inherent in the inter-American system became even clearer. The political method used by Washington, consistent with the spirit of the cold war and the ideological intolerance of Cuba--the first socialist state in the Western hemisphere--appeared as an obvious anachronism against the background of detente.

A hard blow was struck at the very foundations of pan-Americanism. Under the influence of the Latin American countries the OAS adopted the principle of "ideological pluralism," aimed against the doctrine of "incompatibility" between Marxism-Leninism and the principles of the inter-American system, imposed by Washington at the peak of the cold war. Dropping a number of "sanctions" against Cuba in 1975 was an important victory for the collective diplomacy of the Latin American countries. At the same time, an entire system of mutual economic cooperation, including the Latin American economic system (LAES) with Cuba's participation, was set up outside the OAS. Such positive shifts confirm a new deployment of forces developing in Latin America, the gradual withdrawal of a considerable number of countries in the continent from U.S. influence and their aspiration to pursue their own independent course in the world arena.

Under those circumstances, the United States took measures aimed at elaborating and implementing a policy which, while taking to a certain extent into consideration the new realities in Latin America and throughout the world, would enable Washington to strengthen its weakened leadership positions and recapture the initiative within the inter-American system. Under the

Carter administration the emphasis was on advertising the demagogic policy of "defense of human rights" and the efforts to convince the Latin American public and the public in other developing countries of the possibility of their "peaceful cooperation" with imperialism. However, support of the reactionary counterrevolutionary forces in Latin America, which never ceased, and efforts to destabilize "undesirable" regimes were skillfully concealed behind hypocritical views of noninterference and respect for the sovereign rights of the people.

In the final account, this policy as well did not justify the expectations. The revolutionary movement not only was not stopped but became even broader and deeper. The forces of democracy and social progress strengthened and the influence of the ideas of socialism increased.

The popular struggle reached its highest point in Central America and in the Caribbean during the second half of the 1970s. Here contradictions between national interests and Washington's imperial ambitions, inherent in all Latin American countries, were manifested with particular emphasis. It was in this subarea, which for decades had been the target of most unrestrained imperialist interference and plunder, that the oppression by local and foreign exploiters, horrifying poverty and political rightlessness of the masses and economic backwardness and the rule of oligarchic cliques became most closely interwoven.

In the hope of easing the pressure of revolutionary forces and rendering harmless the powderkeg into which this subarea had turned by the end of the 1970s, the Carter administration was forced to accept some of the demands of the patriotic forces. After long and repeatedly interrupted discussions, in 1977 Washington agreed to conclude new treaties with Panama, which stipulated the resumption of Panamanian jurisdiction over the canal zone and the definitive withdrawal of the Americans from the part of the country's territory they had illegally seized at the turn of the century, after 1999. This was a major victory for the Panamanian patriots and the result of their long years of struggle against the American occupation, a struggle which enjoyed the virtually unanimous support of the Latin American peoples and all progressive mankind.

In 1979 the administration in Washington decided not to engage in open armed intervention to rescue from the anger of the people who had risen up the bankrupt dictatorship of the Somoza family, which had become discredited in the eyes of the entire world, and which had cruelly oppressed Nicaragua in the interests of the American monopolies for nearly half a century. The U.S. efforts to strangle in its cradle the Nicaraguan revolution, under the OAS flag, failed. The hopes of inspiring the Sandinista government to revoke the radical socioeconomic changes which were made with the help of a variety of promises, failed as well. After socialist Cuba, Nicaragua took the path of implementing the age-old expectations of the people's masses to which it brought true freedom and independence.

The flame of the liberation struggle of the peoples of the continent rose even higher toward the end of the 1970s. At that time Grenada as well took the path of independent and progressive development after overthrowing the pro-

imperialist dictatorship. The armed struggle of the patriotic forces in El Salvador and Guatemala intensified. Increasing mass activities and insoluble internal contradictions increasingly undermined the power of the military dictatorships in South America as well, controlled by Washington. Class battles waged by the working people spread throughout the continent. The obvious failure of its Latin American policy forced the United States to abandon its hypocritical game of "defense of human rights" and once again to resort to "gunboat diplomacy" and the open use of the "big stick" in relations with its southern neighbors.

2

By the turn of the 1980s ruling U.S. circles had taken a drastic global turn toward increasing tension, unrestrained arms race, intensified confrontation with the socialist world and a fierce struggle against the national liberation movement. The thoughtless and adventuristic actions of the aggressive imperialist forces, their unwillingness to heed the new realities, their reliance on the methods of "power diplomacy" and their policy of brutal dictat and armed intervention were manifested most fully in their approach to Latin American problems.

As early as May 1980, i.e., 8 months before the advent of the present administration, the "Santa Fe committee," which included formerly high-placed generals, diplomats and intelligence agents, drafted a report entitled "A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties," which became a kind of program of action for the extreme reactionary U.S. circles in Latin America. Guided by Washington's imperial ambitions, the authors of the report peremptorily declared that safety interests "justify American interference" in Latin America, for it is of "vital importance to the United States" and to ensuring its global power." They accused the Carter administration of spinelessness toward the countries on the continent, which, allegedly, had increased the "communist danger" and the appearance of a threat of turning the Caribbean into a "red lake." They openly called for "decisive action" against Cuba and Nicaragua, the suppression of the liberation struggle of the Salvadoran and Guatemalan peoples, the denunciation of the Panama Canal treaties and putting the canal under the control of the Inter-American Defense Council or, in other words, the Pentagon. Nor did the report ignore Grenada. It asked that punitive measures be taken against it, for it threatened the sea lanes along which the United States is receiving a considerable percentage of its imported oil.

Soon after the new administration came to power, it became clear that the subregion of Central American and the Caribbean Basin was to become a kind of testing ground on which to develop the methods of "power diplomacy," export of counterrevolution and suppression of liberation movements. As President Reagan himself said, "The Caribbean area is a vitally important strategic and commercial artery for the United States. Nearly one-half of all U.S. trade, two-thirds of the petroleum imported by the country and more than one-half of the strategic resources we import pass through the Panama Canal and the Gulf of Mexico." The energizing of American interference in the domestic affairs of this subregion was motivated by the fact that the development of revolutionary liberation movements in it was a threat to the security of the



United States itself. In Washington's estimates, the purpose of the interventions was to issue a warning to all Latin American countries and to make their peoples abandon struggle for a revision of inequitable relations with the United States and for their own economic and political independence and accept the role of U.S. satellites.

The first Latin American act of the Reagan administration was an open forgery--a "White Paper" about the notorious "communist interference" in the affairs of El Salvador, allegedly conducted from Nicaraguan territory. The "proofs" of this mythical interference, hastily concocted by the CIA and the Department of State by order of the White House, were not taken seriously even by bourgeois politicians. According to C. Arnson, from Johns Hopkins University, J. Glassman, a State Department cadre worker and one of the compilers of the "White Paper," even acknowledged that its contents could "mislead" and were "extremely exaggerated," and that the data used in the book were "extrapolations," i.e., in simple terms, drawn out of thin air (see C. Arnson, "El Salvador. A Revolution Confronts the United States," Washington, 1982, p 74).

Nevertheless, to this day the entire political course followed by the White House on Central America is based on absolutely unconfirmed assertions of "communist interference" in El Salvador and Nicaragua's involvement. References to "arms deliveries" from the outside, fabricated by the U. S. special services, are used by the administration in Washington in an effort to conceal the entirely real and visible American interference in the affairs of Central American and Caribbean countries. As early as November 1981, CIA Director W. Casey submitted at a meeting of the U.S. National Security Council a plan for waging undeclared war on Nicaragua. The plan was approved by the president and, by the end of the year, the CIA undertook the creation of groups of mercenaries to engage in piratical raids inside Nicaragua from Honduran territory for purposes of performing actions of sabotage, subversion, political assassination and destabilization of the Sandinista government. CIA bases, from which counterrevolutionaries make their bandit sorties, were set up on Costa Rican territory as well. In 1983 alone, the direct damage caused Nicaragua by the armed gangs of Somoza supporters, led and financed by the CIA, exceeded \$120 million.

The acts of terrorism carried out by order of the administration in Washington, in particular the mining of Nicaraguan ports, which triggered a blast of indignation on the part of world public opinion, constitute a gross violation of Nicaraguan sovereignty and violate all international legal norms. The U.S. special services are directly involved in this new and even more dangerous form of aggression against Nicaragua. The United States is responsible for piracy along sea lanes in that area. Its actions, as the government of the USSR pointed out in its notes to the U.S. government, dated 21 March 1984, is a direct violation of one of the fundamental principles of international law--the freedom of navigation--and cannot be tolerated.

At the same time, the Pentagon assigned its military advisers and instructors to El Salvador to take over the direct management of the war which the Salvadoran reactionary rulers are waging against the people. A flood of



American weapons is reaching the country. Tens of thousands of Salvadorans have become victims of terrorism and violence in recent years.

American ground, sea and air forces are almost continuously conducting exercises in areas adjacent to El Salvador and Nicaragua. While pursuing a course of intensified military confrontation, the United States is openly threatening to engage in an armed intervention to put an end to the gains of the Nicaraguan revolution and to prevent the victory of the patriots and democrats in El Salvador. The U.S. actions in Central America are considered by the Latin American and the world public as a crying breach of legality and a crime against the peoples and a recurrence of the colonialist plantation-owner mentality which has no place in the contemporary world. They are a clear manifestation of the policy of state terrorism adopted by the current U.S. administration.

The report of the National Commission for Central America, headed by former Secretary of State H. Kissinger, which came out in January 1984, was another confirmation of Washington's unchanged approach to the Central American countries as the patrimony of the monopolies in the United States and the latter's reliance on armed piracy as the principal instrument in resolving the problems of the subregion. The reports, based on the interventionist policy of the present administration with an eye to the immediate future, repeated the virtually complete set of standard incantations concerning the "communist threat." It recommended increased military and financial support of Somoza's gangs and the continuation of the secret CIA war on Nicaragua. It did not exclude the possibility of using force against the Sandinista should this be required by the quite arbitrarily interpreted U.S. "security interests." With a view to strengthening the repressive regimes in El Salvador and Guatemala and turning Honduras into a bridgehead for subversive and punitive activities on the scale of all of Central America, the commission suggested that \$8 billion be appropriated for these regimes over the next 6 years.

The report reasserted the clear aspiration of the American administration to continue to escalate the policy of aggression in the subregion and to prevent the solution of domestic and regional problems by the peoples themselves, without U.S. supervision. Obviously, Washington is still hoping that with the help of "gunboat diplomacy" and export of terrorism and violence it would be able to hold back the development of the revolutionary liberation struggle in Central and Latin America and to galvanize the old system of unchallenged American imperialist domination.

Obviously preparing the grounds for unleashing an armed intervention in Central America, last April President Reagan signed National Security Council Directive No 138, which called for "preventive strikes" against countries which, in Washington's view, could be classified as "terrorist." Last May's television address by the U.S. President, in which he unceremoniously tried to qualify military intervention in the affairs of other peoples as a "legitimate right" and even a "moral obligation," represented an open apology of true terrorism elevated to the rank of state policy and war against democratic and patriotic forces in Central America.

The hegemonistic policy of the Reagan administration and the "right" it gave itself to determine the type of system and even government which the peoples of Central America and the Caribbean should have and the political cause they should follow, and the gross intervention in the affairs of sovereign countries in that subregion, many of which have frequently been victims of U.S. imperialist piracy in the past, are triggering the legitimate concern and indignation of the Latin American public. Such feelings influenced the foreign policies of countries such as Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama, who favor the self-determination of nations and noninterference in the domestic affairs of Central American countries, as well as peaceful political settlement of disputes through equal dialogue between interested parties.

It was to this effect that the ministers of foreign affairs of said countries set up their "Contadora Group" (named after the Panamanian island on which they held their first meeting). However, its mediation efforts, which met with Nicaragua's constructive response, are being steadily rejected by Honduras and El Salvador, which are doing everything possible to lead the group's activities into a channel suitable to Washington. They are interfering in the domestic affairs of Nicaragua and demanding of it concessions affecting its revolutionary gains. It does not suit the ruling U.S. circles in the least that the Latin American countries themselves are firmly assuming the initiative in settling their problems and are developing specific means to this effect. The Reagan administration is sabotaging Nicaragua's efforts to conclude bilateral and multilateral treaties which would guarantee the peace and security of all Central American states. What is necessary from all viewpoints is considered abnormal by the United States, which has become accustomed to using the methods of power diplomacy and to dictate exclusively what it finds suitable. The U.S. attempts to torpedo through its puppets the efforts of the "Contadora Group" and to block Nicaragua's constructive initiatives are triggering the indignation of peace-loving and patriotic forces in Latin America and are contributing to the further worsening of the crisis in inter-American relations.

The contradictions existing between the United States and the overwhelming majority of Latin American countries became particularly aggravated as a result of the "Malvinas crisis," which broke out in April 1982. The actions of the White House, which supported the British colonial adventure in the Falklands (the Malvinas) were sharply condemned and objected to by civilian as well as military governments in Latin America, even those which until then were considered Washington's closest allies. A major blow was dealt to Washington's plans to organize a united anticommunist front jointly with the Latin American bourgeoisie and throughout the inter-American system, by including it in its military-political "Rio de Janeiro Treaty." According to the treaty, together with other participating countries the United States should have taken the side of Argentina, which was attacked. Instead, by supporting its NATO ally, Washington triggered the worst "crisis of faith" in the entire history of the Rio de Janeiro Treaty.

The United States was condemned in a resolution, approved by the overwhelming majority of the participants in the 20th consultative conference of ministers

of foreign affairs of OAS members, which was held in the spring of 1982, for the sanctions adopted against Argentina. The position of the United States, which rejected the resolution and the collective will of the majority of Latin American countries it expressed, further intensified the division within the OAS. The Anglo-Argentine conflict forced state and political leaders on the continent to take a second look at world events, at relations developing between imperialist and developing countries and at problems of the struggle for disarmament and international security. A number of countries on the continent spoke out in favor of taking steps to strengthen regional economic independence and creating a new system of mutual relations which could efficiently defend their interests.

The unconditional American support of the British adventure triggered in Latin American political and social circles a more critical attitude toward the anticommunist military doctrines imposed by the United States for decades, according to which Marxism-Leninism was the "internal enemy" and the main task of the Latin American armed forces was to perform punitive police functions and to suppress the liberation struggle of the peoples. As noted in the study by an Argentine scientist, throughout Latin America "after the Malvinas war in the South Atlantic...the doctrines of 'national security,' 'internal front' and 'ideological boundaries' were questioned" (A. Cohen, "Crisis Política y Poder Armado" [Political Crisis and Armed Power]. Buenos Aires, 1983, p 130). Yet, Washington's entire policy of using the Latin American armed forces for counterrevolutionary purposes and in the interest of preserving the American domination of the continent, rests on the implementation of these doctrines.

The "Malvinas crisis" intensified the general trend of greater struggle for democratic social life in Latin America. This trend was manifested in the defeat of the pro-imperialist military junta in Bolivia and the seizure of power by democratic circles. Under the pressure of the struggle of the masses the military dictatorship in Argentina as well collapsed, yielding to a civilian government. Changes toward democratization of political life are also visible in the largest country on the continent, Brazil. The same trend is also manifested in the increased struggle waged by the patriotic and democratic forces in Chile and Uruguay and the energizing of antidictatorial activities in Paraguay. Opposition to the factual American occupation and the conversion of the country into a U.S. patrimony is increasing in Honduras as well.

Fearing the further weakening of the inter-American system and the failure of its Latin American course, Washington took energetic steps to "restore the trust" between the United States and Latin America. It was in this connection that President Reagan toured several American countries in December 1982. During his trip, the master of the White House actively used economic levers to accomplish his political objectives. Thus, Brazil was promised a new \$1.2 billion loan, the practical purpose of which was to tighten the noose of indebtedness even further. Equally unseemly means were applied to the other countries. However, Reagan carefully ignored the key demands of the Latin American countries relative to trade and economic relations with the United States, such as easing the repayment of foreign debts, lowering the high interest rates of American bank loans and lifting the discriminatory measures against Latin American exports. As a whole, the trip resulted in practically



no improvements in relations between the United States and its southern neighbors. The people's masses everywhere welcomed the American president with demonstrations of protest and the leaders of Brazil and Colombia made the head of the White House clearly understand that they did not share his aggressive aspirations.

It is no accident, therefore, that in recent years the White House has been particularly interested in looking for new allies. It has relied on alienating from the other Latin American countries the island states in the Caribbean and using them to strengthen American economic, political and military presence in the area. The United States makes generous promises for economic aid within the widely advertised "Plan for the Development of the Countries in the Caribbean and Central America," which was described as a "mini-Marshall Plan." Its true nature is no secret to the Latin American public, which considers Washington's "Caribbean initiative" a manifestation of imperial policy and a means of ensuring "hothouse conditions" for American multinational monopolies which have already developed an atmosphere of "tax paradise" for themselves in a number of island states.

Politically, the purpose of the "Caribbean initiative" is to suppress the revolutionary-democratic movements in the subregion and to perpetuate the sociopolitical status quo suitable to the monopolists. As President Reagan said, "Unless we undertake immediate and decisive action, new Cubas will arise from the wreckage of today's conflicts." The meaning of this statement became perfectly clear when a new militaristic bloc—"Regional Security and Defense Forces"—was set up through the efforts of Washington and with its financial support, which included five small Caribbean island countries. The creation of this military-police organization became yet another step in increasing the tension in the Caribbean area and converting it into a new "hot spot" on the planet. The major concern of the Latin American countries caused by the militaristic maneuvers of the United States turned out to be entirely unjustified. It was precisely this bloc which was used as a screen for the piratical U.S. attack on Grenada.

Although it helped to achieve certain domestic political objectives of the ruling circles in Washington by enhancing for a while chauvinistic feelings in the United States, the Grenada invasion exposed in the eyes of the entire world the nature of American imperialist policy, clearly proving its total scorn of international law and the sovereignty of independent countries.

By occupying Grenada, setting up a regime of arbitrariness and most cruel repressions and restoring the privileges of local exploiters on the island, the United States hoped to teach all revolutionary forces in Latin America a tangible "lesson," to frighten them and to force them to surrender to imperialism. This objective was frankly expressed by Secretary of State Schulz, who described the Grenada adventure as a "turning point in history." Now, he cynically said, "we have shown to the entire world that we intend to protect our interests at all cost."

In fact, however, the new crime committed by U.S. imperialism gave an impetus to the further intensification of anti-American feelings on the continent and to the aggravation of the conflicts between Washington and most Latin American



countries. At the 13th annual meeting of the OAS General Assembly, in November 1983, the United States found itself tied to the pillory. Its armed piracy in Grenada was characterized by many of those who attended the meeting as a most flagrant violation of basic norms of international law and United Nations and OAS statutes. They demanded that all foreign troops be withdrawn from the island and called for turning the Caribbean Basin into a zone of peace.

The policy of American imperialism was condemned even more sternly in the Quito Declaration, which was adopted by representatives of 30 Latin American and Caribbean countries in January 1984. In this document, the participants in the conference held in the capital of Ecuador spoke out in favor of a peaceful settlement of disputes and against the use or the threat of force; they sharply criticized the American aggression against Grenada and once again appealed for the solution of Central American problems through talks. The declaration emphasized the need to review inequitable trade and economic relations imposed by the West on Latin American countries and condemned the predatory policy of international financial organizations.

The U.S. aggression against Grenada and the imperialist intervention in Central America were condemned in the Caracas Declaration, which was adopted by the heads of government of eight Latin American countries in the Venezuelan capital, in February. The delegates of 16 countries in the continent, who had met last April at a congress on Latin American unity in Medellin, Colombia, gave a firm "No!" to Washington's instigators and organizers of state terrorism. The delegates to the congress unanimously approved a declaration which sharply condemned aggressive U.S. policy and the efforts of American imperialism to suppress the national liberation movement and delay the development of the democratic process in the area.

In expressing the view held by the overwhelming majority of Latin American countries, Miguel de la Madrid, the Mexican president, publicly condemned those who favor interventionist solutions in Central America and called upon the United States to observe the principles and rules of international law, during his visit to Washington. Influential countries such as Brazil and Argentina have also firmly spoken out in favor of a political settlement in the area and noninterference in the domestic affairs of other countries.

Washington's aggressive course and ceaseless interference in the domestic affairs of Latin American countries and its refusal to review unequal trade and economic relations with its southern neighbors, as well as attempts to shift on their shoulders the burdens of the economic and financial difficulties experienced by world capitalism are leading to a growing alienation of Latin American countries from the United States and contributing to the growth of profound and irreconcilable contradictions between them. Washington is finding it increasingly difficult to keep the continent under political and military control. It would be difficult to assume that countries which have achieved a certain level of economic development and unquestionable international reputation could be kept in the position of politically third-rate countries, ready to be obediently satisfied with playing an unenviable role as satellites of their northern neighbor through methods of economic pressure.

There is also little hope for the United States that it will be able to lead the OAS back on the path of blindly traversing the fairway of a pro-American course and to force Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, Bolivia and Colombia to give up the defense of their national interests and the policy of Latin American solidarity and development of broad extraregional relations. The current situation pervading within the OAS clearly confirms that the days when this organization, which acted as a kind of "U.S. colonial department," was used for rubber-stamping decisions suitable to Washington and camouflaging repressive actions toward revolutionary movement in Latin American countries, are in the past.

Naturally, relying on the support of extreme right-wing forces and dictatorial puppet regimes, the United States still retains major possibilities of consolidating the dependent status of Latin American countries, broadening the realm of domination of American monopoly capital and turning the OAS back on the cold war track. It is to this purpose that Washington is using the entire familiar arsenal of means of supporting its domination, such as subsidies, speculations with the "communist threat," fanning contradictions between individual Latin American countries, pitting one against the other, and engaging in "secret operations" and armed aggressions.

The decisive battles on the continent for the democratization of inter-American relations, for a rejection of the faulty pan-American ideology and practice and for full national liberation lie ahead. Unquestionably, a large number of difficulties will be encountered along this way, caused above all by the fact that the United States retains powerful economic and political pressure levers at its disposal. The positions which American monopoly capital holds in the economies and finances of Latin American countries remains so strong that the leaders of those countries are forced to heed them, one way or another, in their efforts to free themselves from imperialist slavery.

The development of the anti-imperialist and liberation movements in the Latin American peoples and the changed ratio of forces in the international arena, in favor of peace, democracy and socialism, which favor their success, are the major, the determining factors in achieving true independence and resolving vital socioeconomic problems. The high potential of the revolutionary energy of the masses and the steady upsurge of the struggle waged by progressive and patriotic forces, which is assuming a great variety of forms depending on specific circumstances, and the increased influence of the working class and its political vanguard, the communist parties of Latin America, are all instilling confidence in the final triumph of the ideals of freedom and social progress in this unfortunate part of the earth.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1894

5003

CSO: 1802/15

ATTENTION: REVANCHISM!

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) pp 126-127

[Article by V. Nekrasov]

[Text] Revanchism is once again rearing its head on West German soil. Perhaps, taken by itself, this phenomenon may be the scum floating on the surface of the difficult sociopolitical life in the country and unworthy of serious attention, unless...unless one can see behind it the activity of forces which are far more significant and sinister in terms of their aspirations and unless its manifestation confirms or merely attempts to galvanize the notorious "German spirit," which experienced a crushing collapse 40 years ago and has nothing in common with the legitimate national feelings of the German people.

Actually, what could those "eternally of yesterday," as they are justifiably described, realistically hope for as they dream of returning to the capitalist system the irrevocably lost "Eastern lands," and the "lebensraum," promised to them by the now-dead Fuehrer? Could it be that these "utopians," if you will forgive the term, are unaware of the fact that the territorial and political structure in Europe, as it developed as a result of World War II and postwar developments, is definitive, inviolable and not subject to any revision? Naturally, they know this. They also know that the firm and principled position held on this question by the military political alliance of the socialist countries--the Warsaw Pact--provides the most substantial material guarantee of the inviolability of the existing situation.

The categorical stance held by the socialist countries is dictated above all by their sincere and profound concern for the consolidation of European peace. It logically proceeds from the experience in international developments throughout the entire 20th century. The unquestionable justice of this position was acknowledged by the unanimous support given to it by all participants in the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Furthermore, the FRG leadership itself expressed its full agreement with it by signing the 1970 Moscow Treaty with the Soviet Union and corresponding treaties with Poland, the GDR and Czechoslovakia.

Today the Europeans, legitimately concerned by the noisy "expressions of will" of "Silesians," "Pomeranians" and "Prussians" and the likes of them who have come out of nowhere, are being lulled by the assurances that several million such "refugees" allegedly represent no one other than themselves. In such a case, however, who do the 44 Bundestag deputies, members of revanchist organizations, represent? Or else, on whose behalf does the Bundestag make declarations on relations between the FRG and the GDR which, as NEUES DEUTSCHLAND pointed out, "are sprinkled with revanchist appeals?"

No, everything is in no way as innocent as the people in Bonn would like to make it seem, particularly if we consider, to cite the social democratic publication "Parlamentarische--Politischer Pressedinst," that for some time now the CDU/CSU ruling party has resumed its propaganda of a "clearly manifested hostile attitude toward the Soviet Union." We should recall in this connection Article 26 of Bonn's constitution: "Actions which are liable to disturb the peaceful joint life of the peoples and which are undertaken to this effect and, in particular, for the sake of preparations for waging aggressive war, are unconstitutional."

The current turpid foam on the surface of West German political life, whipped up with shrieking revanchist propaganda, is merely the cover (or combat reconnaissance, to use a military term dear to the revanchist hearts) for preparations for much more dangerous actions, not only on the part of the FRG itself but the imperialist forces, for a main strike by the Washington rulers. As the course of events is making clear, it is a question of a strategic maneuver carried out with a view to undermining the entire complex of postwar peace settlements agreed upon by the main participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition--the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain and, subsequently, France. More precisely, it is a question of the principles agreed upon in Yalta and Potsdam, which have honorably withstood the test of life.

The campaign, which was resumed overseas on the "inequity" of the Allies' wartime decisions, is closely tied to the laments of the Rhine revanchists concerning the "forcible decision" of Germany and the "tearing away" of its "eastern" and "southern" lands. It is precisely the high officials in the Reagan administration who have assumed today the mission of rescuing from oblivion the cold war concepts which dispute the existing boundaries separating the European countries and oppose the territorial and political realities which have become established in Europe.

It is thus, that in the footsteps of his boss, who has promised to dump socialism on the "ash heap of history," that U.S. Vice President Bush said in Vienna on 21 September 1983 that "we consider the division of Europe illegal." U.S. Secretary of State Schulz as well questioned the "legality" of existing European borders in his speech at the Stockholm Conference on Strengthening Trust, Security and Disarmament in Europe. This reveals another fully defined line in Washington's adventuristic course regarding the European continent. According to the Swedish newspaper NORSHENSFLAMMAN, "The purpose of the United States today is not only to fill Europe with nuclear weapons but to change existing borders. This, however, means planning a war."



The views expressed by FRG revanchist forces on the "division of Europe" in the Washington Declaration passed at the recent NATO council meeting, can mean nothing else. The leanings of the American and NATO military cannot fail to be understood in the West German capital. Nevertheless, on the revanchist as well as the government levels, Bonn is not only not objecting but, on the contrary, is actually expressing its solidarity with the objectives of the ruling U.S. circles.

At this point there is no longer a place for jokes or discussions to the effect that the Soviet Union is artificially promoting alarm on the subject of the energizing of revanchist circles: the fact that revanchism is drawing closer to the militaristic policy of the United States in Western Europe increases even further the real threat to peace. As diplomatically stated by some journalists in STERN, the problems of the structure of Europe, combined with American missiles, "assume a new significance." Yes, they do, for once again the threat of a major war arises from German soil. Some leaders in neighboring countries of the FRG are being unpardonably frivolous, people such as J. Chirac, who represents the French opposition, when they express their willingness to consider the conditions under which Bonn could be admitted to exercise "joint" control over Western nuclear weapons.

German imperialism has always been characterized by high-handedness and unscrupulousness. As V. I. Lenin pointed out as early as 1918, the German war party "has become too accustomed to relying on the power of the sword..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 337). The nature of the German imperialists remained the same subsequently as well, flooding Europe with a sea of blood during World War II.

The materials of the Teheran conference, in which the leaders of the three great powers heading the anti-Hitlerite coalition expressed their fears of a possible restoration of German militarism, are worthy of serious attention. Thus, the notes on the talks held between Stalin and U.S. President Roosevelt on 29 November 1943 state that "if Germany is totally unrestrained, Stalin fears that Germany may recover soon. Germany would require no more than a few years to accomplish this. This first big war, which was started by Germany in the 1870s, ended in 1872. Only 42 years later, i.e., in 1914, Germany initiated a new war; 21 years later, i.e., in 1939, once again Germany started a war. As can be seen, the time needed for the recovery of Germany is diminishing." Naturally, it was not a question of the recovery of the national economy and conditions for peaceful life, but of the possible rebirth of the infamous German militarism. Taking this threat into consideration, at the Potsdam conference the allies made important decisions to prevent such a development of events. Unfortunately, the Western countries declined to implement in their zones of occupation the agreements reached on this account.

West German militarism and revanchism are now firmly blocked in the center of Europe through the actions of the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving democratic forces. However, the lessons of history demand vigilance to this day. Mankind has a good memory and those who would like to plunge into new adventures, riding the American "Pershings," should not rely on its forgetfulness. It is the joint duty of the peoples to do everything necessary to preserve peace for the present and future generations. "This is made

incumbent," emphasized A. A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs, at the luncheon in honor of H.-D. Genscher, FRG minister of foreign affairs, "by the Potsdam agreement, the Moscow treaty and the Helsinki Final Act."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/15

## THE BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 9, Jun 84 (signed to press 18 Jun 84) p 128

[Text] 1. Chernenko, K. U. "Narod i Partiya Yediny" [People and Party Are as One]. Selected speeches and articles. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 496 pp, one photograph.

2. Chernenko, K. U. "Po-Leninski Zhit', Rabotat', Borot'sya" [Live, Work and Struggle Like Lenin]. Speech delivered at the All-Army Conference of Secretaries of Komsomol Organizations on 28 May 1984. V. A. Pechenev and V. V. Pribytkov responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 16 pp.

3. "O Reforme Obshcheobrazovatel'noy i Professional'noy Shkoly" [On the Reform of General Education and Vocational Schools]. Collection of documents and materials. G. S. Strizhov responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 112 pp.

4. "Vizit v Sovetskiy Soyuz Pervogo Sekretarya TsK PORP, Predsedatelya Soveta Ministrov PNR Voytsekha Yaruzel'skogo 4-5 Maya 1984 Goda" [Visit to the Soviet Union by Wojciech Jaruzelski, First Secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Poland on 4-5 May 1984]. Documents and materials. V. V. Sharapov responsible for publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 63 pp with illustrations.

5. Asoyan, B. R. "Idikiye Gusi' Ubivayut na Rassvete" ["Wild Geese" Are Killed at Dawn]. The secret war against Africa. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 175 pp.

6. Blishchenko, I. P. "Obychnoye Oruzhiye i Mezhdunarodnoye Pravo" [Conventional Weapons and International Law]. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1984, 215 pp.

7. "Vernost' Dolgu" [Loyalty to Duty]. Essays on scouts. Compiled by I. Vasilevich. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 415 pp with illustrations.

8. Vinogradov, N. N. "Rol' Kommunistov v Gosudarstvennykh i Obshchestvennykh Organizatsiyakh" [The Role of Communists in State and Public Organizations]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 64 pp. (Party worker's library; 1.)

9. Vorozheykin, I. Ye. "Letopis' Trudovogo Geroizma" [Chronicle of Labor Heroism]. Short history of the socialist competition in the USSR. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 336 pp.
10. Gurevich, P. S. "Sotsial'naya Mifologiya" [Social Mythology]. Mysl', Moscow, 1983, 175 pp. (Critique of bourgeois ideology and revisionism.)
11. "Delo Obshchenarodnoye" [Cause of the Whole People]. The communists in the struggle for the implementation of the USSR Food Program. Compiled by I. P. Magay. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 349 pp.
12. Kiyashchenko, N. I. and Leyzerov, N. L. "Teoriya Otrazheniya i Problemy Estetiki" [The Theory of Reflection and Problems of Aesthetics]. Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1983, 224 pp.
13. Koval', B. I. "Revolyutsiya Prodolzhayetsya" [The Revolution Is Continuing] (Experience of the 1970s). Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 177 pp.
14. Listvinov, Yu. N. "Apokalipsis iz Vashingtona" [Apocalypse From Washington] (United States: weapons and politics.) Izdatel'stvo APN, Moscow, 1984, 288 pp.
15. Motorin, D. K. "Vozrozhdenyy Sevastopol" [Sevastopol Reborn]. Essays on the rebuilding of the city 1944-1953. N. K. Proskuryakov responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 271 pp.
16. Murian, V. M. "Khudozhestvennyy Mir Fil'ma" [The Artistic World of the Motion Picture] (Cinematographic imagery in the light of the Leninist theory of reflection). Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1984, 288 pp.
17. "Ni Slova Protiv Sovesti" [Not a Word Against Conscience]. Compiled by V. T. Stepanov, V. A. Isayev and V. A. Teplukhin. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 192 pp.
18. Ovsyannikov, M. F. "Istoriya Esteticheskoy Mysli" [History of Aesthetic Thinking]. Second expanded and revised edition. Textbook for philosophy department students in universities and art VUZs. Vysshaya Shkola, Moscow, 1984, 336 pp.
19. Ozerov, V. M. "Sovremenniki i Predshestvenniki" [Contemporaries and Predecessors]. Literary criticism essays. Sovetskiy Pisatel', Moscow, 1983, 344 pp.
20. Ortenberg, D. I. "Eto Ostanetsya Navsegda" [This Will Remain Forever]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 335 pp with illustrations.
21. Pirogov, S. V. "Upravleniye Naukoy" [Science Management] (Socioeconomic aspect). Mysl, Moscow 1983, 190 pp.
22. Protozanov, A. K. "Partiynaya Zabota ob Okhrane Prirody" [Party Concern for Environmental Protection]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1984, 65 pp [Party worker's library; 2).



23. Tupchiyenko, L. S. "Sotsialisticheskiy Obraz Zhizni Kak Ob'yekt Upravleniya" [The Socialist Way of Life as an Object of Management]. Mysl', Moscow, 1983, 164 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/15

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

28 Sept 1984